

तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

SANTINIKETAN
VISWA BHARATI
LIBRARY

273.1

M 57

INDIA IMMORTAL

by

E. DE MEULDER, S.J.

1946

CATHOLIC PRESS
RANCHI



ON EARTH PEACE
TO MEN OF GOOD WILL

TO
MY MOTHER

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE CHARTER OF HUMANITY'S TRUE FREEDOM	
PILATE, THE SCEPTIC.	3
RELIGION, THE WHOLE OF MAN	33
JESUS CHRIST	63
CHRISTIANITY, THE WHOLE OF RELIGION .	97
CATHOLICISM, THE WHOLE OF CHRISTIANITY .	123
HOMeward BOUND	155
REBUILDING A NATION	
CATHOLICISM & CULTURE	173
LOVE YOUR MOTHERLAND	187
CATHOLICISM, THE BRIDGE BETWEEN EASTERN & WESTERN THOUGHT .	197
CATHOLIC RENAISSANCE IN INDIAN ART . .	205
WHO IS WOMAN'S TRUE LIBERATOR? . .	213
THE ECONOMIC STRUCTURE OF A NATION .	227
VOLUNTEERS OF JESUS CHRIST	243

Part I

The Charter of Humanity's True Freedom

IT is sometimes easy to give one's country blood and easier to give her money. Sometimes the hardest of all is to give her Truth.

G. K. CHESTERTON

Pilate the Sceptic

WHAT IS TRUTH ?

FAR AWAY from God who is Life and Truth, modern man feels lonely and a stranger on this earth. Modern man is not happy. G. K. Chesterton gives the reason :

“ A man hoards with his pocket, he digests with his stomach, but he is happy with his soul....., men are spiritually unhappy which comes before the fact that they are economically and materially unhappy though this is quite as much of a fact too.” A few years ago, a young and promising leader of a very respectable family and a most brilliant student of Calcutta University put an end to his life. In a farewell letter to his father he wrote : “ I die with the sincere conviction that in some far off birth under the dim twilight....., we shall meet again as father and son and shall recognize each other and shall meet under happier circumstances when poverty, want, and sorrow shall be things unknown.”

Yet even by suicide, you cannot escape from God and from your own immortal soul.

Does God exist ? asks the sceptic, and his answer bears the hall-mark of his half-intellectual milieu : a question mark. Is revelation possible ?— A question mark... Are miracles possible ?— A question mark... How did men come to be religious ???

Pierre L'Hermite, a leading French journalist, tells us a delightful story which goes to show how frightfully dogmatic the sceptic can be, no less dogmatic than his twin brother the relativist.

Four French boys, having hardly finished their school days, held a meeting amongst themselves to decide, once for all, the question of the existence of God. After a vigorous debate the motion was put to the vote and the proposition "God does not exist" was carried by a majority.

Therefore God does not exist. These four boys are typical of Modern Unbelief.

The thief desires that there be no light ; for the same reason many a modern man desires that there be no God. He does not know, and does not want to know, the answer to the question "Why should I be moral?" Why should I, at times, sacrifice my pleasures for my higher self or for the good of my fellow men? That is why, even in rich and free countries, there are slaves with no gyves upon their ankles, no brandmark on their shoulders, yet slaves, for having rejected Him "Whom to serve is to reign".

No slaves are worse off than civilized slaves, and no barbarians are worse than civilized barbarians. Many of the modern intellectuals, including writers, servants, poets and professors are responsible for the present disorders in the soul of modern youth. Youth is not only in need of science.

Never more than at present was modern youth in need of clear principles, a consistent Philosophy, Religion and God.

"Men like Gods" wrote H. G. Wells.

We know Owen Dudley's answer, "Will men be like Gods?"

The "men like Gods" do not exist. Let us then simply remember our calling as men, our dignity, our greatness.

If I am bitter at times in this book, it is because I feel that syncretism, the creed of half truths and compromise, is dragging down modern youth from its high calling and dignity.

"God give us men. A time like this demands

Great hearts, strong minds, true faith and willing hands,
Men whom the lust of office does not kill ;

Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy ;
Men who possess opinion and a will ;
Men who have honour, men who will not lie."

OLIVER HOLMES

The modern fashion in religion is relativism. There is no conception which is more easy. Never again have you to answer any question with an absolute yes or no. Everything in religion becomes soft and easy, any hard truth is thrown into the lumber-room. According to this modern dogma, everything is imperfect, everything is evolving ; no one is wholly right, no one is wholly wrong. Relativism can be extremely tolerant because it has no backbone. It can claim to be universal in the sense that each one may hold any opinion, and his neighbour the exact opposite, and both will be beautifully right, and in this way the monopoly and certitude of truth will disappear and with it the whole train of intolerance.

I mentioned the word dogma in connection with relativism. I should not have done so, for the relativist considers it bad taste and a sign of intellectual backwardness to talk seriously about dogmas. One asks oneself why the relativist continues to call himself a Christian, a Muslim, a Hindu. This has no meaning unless he holds Christian, Muslim or Hindu dogmas. The Mahabharata has whispered something terrible into the ears of the relativist :

" A religion that has no truth is no religion, and the truth that wears a mask is no truth."

One of the first fruits of relativism in dogma is relativism in morals. The most dangerous attack on morals is the intellectual attack. It is more dangerous than the emotional attack.

" Woe unto you that call evil good, and good evil ; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness ; and put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter " (ISAIAH v, 20). Speak to the relativist of unchangeable and eternal principles in morality based on the essence of human nature and rooted in God, and he will smile at you. Evidently one should do no wrong, but who

determines the boundaries between good and evil? Are those limits not man-made inventions which change with the rhythm of evolution? Did our ancestors not call immoral what we now consider (in dozens of leading papers) expressions of beauty and health? So reasons the relativist, and shows thereby that in the line of religion he has lost the art — or is it the courage? — of thinking. It is as if he were saying: I know that there is adulterated food in the world, therefore strong and healthy human food does not exist; I will try to live on experience. The relativist is the anaemic in religion, because he believes that any food will do to satisfy his appetite. He should remember that he needs human food.

When I heckle the syncretist, I do not mean to attack the student of Comparative Religion, for these are two quite different persons. However, the difference between Comparative Religion as a science, and as a philosophy, should be clearly borne in mind. Much of the anarchy in thinking comes from mixing up the two.

(1) Comparative Religion as a science deals with the historic description (hierography), the development and inter-relation (hierology) of the various religions of mankind. In co-ordinating and explaining the facts offered by hierography, hierology can use three methods.

(a) THE HISTORICAL METHOD — The most objective, but limited in scope for want of historic documents.

(b) THE ETHNOLOGICAL METHOD — Pure and simple; based on the study of man and his tendencies, very much open to arbitrary deductions. Its deductions, its application to philosophy (Hegel), biology (Darwin) and sociology (Karl Marx), show that it is nearly always based on the *a priori* and false postulate that "Every higher form must be derived from a lower one".

(c) THE HISTORICO-CULTURAL METHOD — The most modern, propounded by the Austrians. It tries to

keep all that is good in the ethnological method, but makes it at the same time historical. It studies religion, not in itself, and in the abstract, but in the concrete, in the "cultural cycle", which means in the complex of the whole civilization. This method has shown, for instance, that Pygmies, in their most ancient cultural cycle, were monotheists: and in general that polytheism, animism, etc., are derived by a descending degeneration from original monotheism.

(2) Comparative Religion as a philosophy (hierarchy) deals with the more fundamental problem of the existence and nature of religion. The philosophic problem must be determined mainly by the metaphysical method of abstract reasoning on the necessities of the case. Philosophy wants to know not only the how but the why, not only the proximate cause but the remote and ultimate cause of religion. Here the philosopher is the specialist. Therefore, the problem will finally be solved according to the philosophy of the sentimentalist, the fideist, the nominalist, the materialist, or the realist. Hence the importance of right philosophical principles.

Catholicism has a philosophy based on reason; it does not make *a priori* "comparativist" assumptions. For instance we can prove the existence of God, whereas the atheist cannot disprove God's existence. God's non-existence remains a mere assumption of his.

We do not criticize certain comparativist writers for making hypotheses and theories, as distinct from facts; we do not criticize them for utilizing certain hypotheses suggested by philosophical conceptions. We often criticize them because their particular philosophies are wrong, and their borrowed hypotheses faulty. Further, we criticize them because they do not always make it plain that the hypotheses in question are not suggested by the facts themselves, but borrowed from elsewhere. And we further criticize them because only too often they advance these hypotheses as certain and true simply because they happen to explain the facts;

whereas from this standpoint they ought to be regarded as working hypotheses only, and whatever certitude they possess should be sought elsewhere, i.e. in philosophy.

If anyone wishes to study more thoroughly the Catholic Principles on this point, I would refer him, for instance, to :

(1) *Studies in Comparative Religion*, 5 vols., C.T.S. 36/40 Eccleston Square, London S.W. (2) *The Life of the Church*, edited by M.C. D'ARCY, S.J., Sheed & Ward. (3) *L'Etude Comparee des Religions*, PERE PINARD DE LA BOULLAYE, S.J., Paris, Gabriel Beauchesne, Rue de Rennes 117. (4) *Der Ursprung der Gottesidee*, 5 vols. DR. SCHMIDT, the world-famous ethnologist. (5) DR. SCHMIDT's smaller work on *The Origin and Growth of Religion* has been translated into English. (6) *Light of the East*, Cath. Monthly, Calcutta. (7) *The New Review*, Calcutta.

Now let us return from the scientist to the relativist. Let no relativist think that relativism is a very modern achievement, the flower of a scientific age.

Pilate, the refined and highly cultured Roman Governor of Palestine at the time of Jesus Christ, was a relativist in religion. Nothing is more tragic than to study¹ that man when faced with Jesus Christ. Pilate, the arbiter of justice, sat upon his marble chair when the Pharisees, together with a mob from the outskirts of Jerusalem, brought before him a Figure silent and unmoved, yet stained with blood, bespattered with spittle and filth, with bruises marked across his face. Jesus stood before him, silent and in His very silence seeming to command. It became a tremendous experience for Pilate to face this Man who claimed to be King of a Kingdom that was not of this world. You all know at least the outlines of the endless trial which followed ; the desperate efforts of the weak judge Pilate to save this innocent Man from the crowd who clamoured for His death, because He had "made Himself the Son of God" ; the scourging of Christ ordered by Pilate in order to arouse pity ; the shameful choice offered to

1. Cf. *The Passion and Death of Our Lord Jesus Christ*. Chapters VIII and IX, by ARCHBISHOP GOODIER, S.J.—London, Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd.

the mob between Christ and the murderer Barabbas, and the final surrender of Jesus to be crucified though Pilate had three times solemnly declared Him innocent. But the great struggle of Pilate was not a struggle with a crowd. Roman Governors had many means at hand to deal with crowds. The real struggle was a struggle with the grace and truth which the sweet and majestic Figure of Christ radiated in his soul. The Gospels give evidence that more than once in that great trial Pilate was on the point of joining the noble band of Jesus' conquests, such as Nicodemus, the women of Samaria and of Magdala, Levi, the Roman soldier of Capharnaum. But Pilate chose "to love darkness rather than Light". In order to hide his emotion, Pilate more than once called Jesus aside from the crowd. He now asked Him: "Whence art Thou?"—"Art Thou a king then?" Then it was that the beaten Figure rose to its full stature, expressing kingship in every gesture despite the bonds and the foulness.

Jesus answered :

"Thou sayest that I am a king ;

For this was I born

And for this came I into the world

That I should give testimony to the Truth.

Everyone that is of the Truth

Heareth My voice."

These words were a last offer of Jesus to the soul of Pilate.

Pilate listened with awe and reverence to these words of the King of Truth. But he noticed at once that Truth, in the mouth of Jesus, had a meaning very different from that to which he was accustomed. To Jesus, Truth was not something vague, it was something definite, something which would entail sacrifice. Pilate felt that this voice of Truth threatened to put him out of harmony with his world. In that case this Voice of Truth must be silenced. And Pilate surrendered his soul to non-Truth, and in that surrender he escaped from the loving embrace of Christ.

And Pilate spoke to Jesus with a smile of pity those typical words of the eternal sceptic : " What is Truth ? "

• How many there are who follow Pilate !

Many modern relativists also allow Religion to expose its faith, and how grand they feel when they can give the verdict : " What is Truth ? " Let them remember however that, as in the case of Pilate, a moment will come when they will have to take a decision of yes or no on the point of Truth.

It was Pilate who, though willing to save Jesus Christ, finally had Him scourged. It was Pilate who nailed Truth to the Cross !

No ! the philosophy of relativism is not a modern invention. Pilate belonged to a nation that tried the experiment of relativism, with disastrous results both for individuals and for the nation itself. We actually talk about the pantheons of Rome and Greece as about a collection of old fossils. Their history proved that ideas rule history, and that it is a dangerous game to gamble with ideas. When the time had come boldly to face the Truth, the leaders of the nation turned away their faces, washed their hands of the blood of the martyrs and juggled with words in order to save the official religion of Rome where, in the words of Petronius, " it was easier to find a god than a man ".

Barring the early attempts of Plato and Aristotle who built up the main lines of a purely natural philosophy, the main rational framework of which became the receptacle of a supernatural religion, all the others tried their hands at some form or other of relativism : Herodotus, the first comparativist ; Pyrrho, the atheist ; Epicurus, the pragmatist ; the sceptics of the new Academy ; Evhemerus with the system which bears his name ; Plutarch and many others all tried and failed.

Stoicism made a desperate attempt to safeguard and revive the old mythologies by explaining everything allegorically. Under the searching splendour of Christianity, the Stoics succeeded, in the second and third centuries in purifying much of the old alloy and produced a small élite of outstanding religious men ;

but universal tolerance was bound to sweep away even these, and soon we find Cotta, the high-priest of Rome, who doubted his own religious system and found it difficult to convince himself of the existence of God. The religious situation may be summed up in the words of Pope Leo the Great (440-61): "Though (imperial) Rome had subjected nearly all the nations (of the then known world), yet it was subject to, and served the errors of, all those peoples and it imagined it had acquired a great religion because it had not rejected any error." (In *Nat. Apost. Petri et Pauli*)

THE CHALLENGE

It was in the atmosphere of this period, the most syncretistic in the world's history, that the cry arose "One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism!"

It was indeed a challenge. In the words of Chesterton in *The Everlasting Man*: "Nobody understands the nature of the Church or the ringing note of the Creed descending from antiquity who does not understand that the whole world once very nearly died of broadmindedness and the brotherhood of all religions."

This cry of the first Christians roused opposition. At first the relativists tried to smother it in blood. When they found that this attempt was hopeless, they tried more modern methods. There is not one objection raised by modern "comparativists" against Christianity which has not been raised (and answered) in the days of Greece and Rome.

Great minds like Fronto, teacher of Marcus Aurelius; Celsus, Philostratos have exhausted the modern classical series of objections against Christ and Christianity. Philostratos wrote his famous life of Apollonius of Tyana (Cf. HASTINGS' *Encyclopedia of*

Religions.) in such a way as to make him the central figure which the official religion would be able to oppose to Christianity. The cleverest and most violent opponents of Christianity were Porphyry and Julian the Apostate.

A religion was manufactured where all the gods, local or foreign, would find a place: Jupiter next to Mithras, Osiris, Attis, Ammon and even Jesus, — where all would be able to find satisfaction; the noble aspirations of the Stoic side by side with the lowest instincts of the sensual man. St. Augustine, in book XVI of the *Civitas Dei*, speaks of a Roman philosopher who was devout to the “*Communis pater quem mille modis concordia discordia veneramur*”, which means: to the “Common Father.....whom we all adore in an harmonious concord of discordant views”. Alexander Severus (235) must have thought himself very broadminded when he looked in his “*Lararium*” at the statue of Christ next to those of Orpheus, Abraham and Appolonius of Tyana; just as the members of the Rama Krishna Mission, who in their Madras prayer-hall have put Christ next to the goddess of learning, Saraswati, the Lord Buddha and the Lord Mohammed. The 247 speakers of the World Conference of Religions (1933) at Chicago are not necessarily a proof of renaissance in religion

THEOSOPHISM

I am glad to know that the best Hindu and Moslem thinkers and the most serious religious men of this fair land would agree with the statement of C. C. Martindale in *The New Review* :

“To our mind, every ancient thought, noble and illuminating in itself, has been degraded by the adepts of that system whether those thoughts be Greek, Persian,

Indian or other." Yet it is interesting to study this typical attempt at relativism. The attempts of Mirza Ghulam Ahmed (1838-1908) and Siva Narayan Agnihotri (born in 1850) have never influenced many. But Theosophy, with its vile attacks on Christ and Christianity, was taken seriously by many, and some of its dogmas are still dished up as infallible declarations by more than one paper or review of to-day.

The foundress of the movement was Madame Blavatski who transferred the headquarters to Madras, Adyar, in December, 1882. The leaders of the movement, v.g. Colonel Olcott, are agreed that she was an arch-liar. Two myths, started by her, have become famous :

(1) *The story of her communication with the Mahatmas in Tibet.*— Few people have made such a caricature of Buddhist or Hindu thought as she. She could not even spell the commonest Sanskrit words and she showed that she had never read the Bhagavat Gita.

(2) *The legend of her own virginity.*— She did not dare to re-enter a town where she had once lived for fear that her scandalous life would call for protest. For particulars, I refer the reader to Farquhar's *Modern Religious Movements*.

Yet before that lady's occult room, the most impudent piece of fraud ever imagined, both Europeans and Indians presented their requests in the form of letters, burnt incense and thought that the new world religion was born.

Mrs. Besant was the successor of this lady. Whatever may be her merits or failures in political life, as a religious leader Mrs. Besant cannot claim anyone's respect. She too did not blush to stoop to shameful fraud (Cf. FARQUHAR, p. 268.), she was the associate of Mr. C. W. Leadbeater, an immoral teacher and publicly branded as such in the Madras Court. Yet Mrs. Besant and Mr. Leadbeater proclaimed each other prophet and prophetess together with a Madras boy, Krishnamurti, the vehicle of the coming Messiah. And

many believed her when she said that in 13,500 B.C., Jesus was the wife of an emperor of Southern India, or when she related a record series of repeated incarnations of the Theosophic stars (herself included of course) of the Adyar headquarters. From a scientific study of historical records connected with the society, Dr. Farquhar has another tale to tell about those Theosophic stars:

- (1) Madame Blavatsky's frauds.
- (2) Judge's shrine burning and forgeries.
- (3) Sinnet's editorial achievements.
- (4) Olcott's inaccuracies and lies.
- (5) Leadbeater's immoralities.
- (6) Mrs. Besant's behaviour in Judge's case.

I do not like to say this; but it is a fact that many a Hindu hailed the movement as the salvation of Hindu thought.² They did not notice that all that was greatest in Hindu thought was being degraded through contact with that movement. In fact the ashes of the great Indian thinkers of Bharat must have stirred in their river-beds when all that was great and sound in Hindu thought was desecrated through contact with that woman. Whatever be the value of the attacks which modern writers level against the orthodox Hindus of our day, yet those orthodox Hindus ought to be congratulated that as a group they never associated themselves with this kind of movement. The orthodox Hindu, unlike those who constantly attack him, knows what he holds — and that alone is an achievement in the modern chaos of religious thought — and I do believe that on the point of doctrine, the orthodox Hindu or Moslem is right to a far greater extent than the "modern" Hindu or the "modern" Moslem whatever that may mean. Whatever be their shortcomings, it is the orthodox Hindu and Muslim who guard and defend the heirloom of Hindu and Moslem thought against the withering blast of modernism.

2. In the vast Theosophic literature not one scholarly work has ever been found.

THE INSUFFICIENCY OF NATURAL RELIGION

From a study of the history of religions it becomes clear that a purely rational religion has never been able to satisfy the mind and the heart of man. However high human reason has soared in Samkara or Aristotle, a reaction has always followed. New geniuses have tried desperately to bring God close to the human heart and the human soul in some visible form. What is the reason of this final dissatisfaction with the highest religious thought of man?

The failure of one of the latest purely theistic bodies is described by Ranade in his *Essays*: "Many enthusiastic leaders of the Brahmo Samaj movement have been heard deliberately to declare that the only cardinal points of Theism necessary to constitute it a religion of mankind, the only articles of its confession of faith, are the Fatherhood of God, and Brotherhood of man. These are the only points which it is absolutely necessary to hold fast to for purposes of regeneration and salvation. And with fifty years of working history, our leaders seem content to lisp this same story of early childhood. There is no attempt at grasping in all earnestness the great religious difficulties which have puzzled people's faith during all time, and driven them to seek rest in revelation To come nearer home, our friends of the Prarthana Samaj seem to be perfectly satisfied with a creed which consists of only one positive belief in the unity of God, accompanied with a special protest against the existing corruptions of Hindu religion, viz. the article which denounces the prevalent idolatry to be sin, and an abomination; it is ardently hoped that a new Church can be built in course of time on such a narrow foundation of belief.....It is time, we think, to venture on an earnest attempt to remove this reproach."

MORAL NECESSITY OF A REVELATION

Corresponding to the historical insufficiency of a purely rational religion there has always appeared the moral necessity of a revelation. All men know vaguely that man, when dying, does not fall down like a dead animal ; they know that, besides his corpse, something will remain. But what is it ? Where will it go ? Is it immortal ? A few giants in the East and West have succeeded in establishing on a rational basis the immortality of the soul, the existence of God, and a few more points ; but even with them much has remained speculation or aspiration without certainty, and therefore without practical value for the average human life. What is to be said about so many other philosophers who did not reach as far, or reached as far but perverted their conclusion through prejudice or unproved assumption ? Would we not to a great extent be ignorant of the most essential problems of life if we had no other way to truth but the choice between Spinoza, Descartes, Kant, Samkara, Hegel, Schelling, Hartmann, Nietzsche, Tolstoi, Ramanuja and a host of others in East and West ? All those men, whether sincere or not, have searched the iron screen of the world and hammered on it with both fists for an answer to our most gripping problems, but the echo roused has more often than not been discordant, and always unsatisfactory and incomplete.

It is *certitude* we want in our lives ; we want to know where we come from, where we go to, what we are here for, whether life should be organized on a purely materialistic basis, or a purely spiritual basis, or on a material-spiritual basis and why. Is there such a thing as sin ? Besides it is not enough to know the Truth ; we must live up to it. Here again, strictly speaking, man left to his unaided natural forces *can*

act morally but all of us know, even the greatest and most heroic among us, that often we see what is to be done but have not the moral grit to act up to the Truth. We will see further on in our study the reason of this weakness in humanity. Suffice it to say here that our will as well as our mind clamour for a supernatural light and a supernatural grace.

We have seen above that there are various common attitudes of men towards religion, especially materialism, scepticism, absolute exclusivism, subjectivism, relativism. The Catholic attitude belongs to none of these, and the earliest and most classical writers of Christianity, beginning with Justin, have always stressed this point. What then is the Catholic attitude? This question will be answered in this book to the best of my abilities. Here I wish only to point out a few characteristics of Catholicism.

(1) Catholicism does not believe Mr. Guess when he tells us that one religion is as good as another. "One religion as good as another" is the shallow dogma of the modern press. It is as if it said : One book looks like another book, same cover, same size ; therefore this book is the same as the other. Or still better : a monkey walks very much like a man without trousers, therefore a man is only a cultured monkey. Apehood=Manhood. Always the same logical flaw in the way of reasoning, viz. to conclude from similarity to identity. A religion has to be judged by its goal and by the means it offers to reach that goal. Now Mr. Fact will tell us that all religions have not the same goal ; in fact, that they differ very much on this capital point ; for instance, according to many, the ultimate end of man is the "*nishreyasam*" supreme rest or beatitude of the soul which some identify with dwelling in paradise, some with aloofness, some with practical extinction, some with absorption and identification or some other kind of union with the divinity.

Besides, all religions do not use the same means. "Unimportant !" says Mr. Guess. "Very important !"

answers Mr. Fact. "Are you going to say that, in order to reach the highest end of man, viz. the complete harmony with himself, with God and with nature, it is indifferent whether you use Hindu *ahimsa* or the human sacrifices of certain Australian tribes in honour of the divinity;—indifferent to follow Islam or the savage rites of the Bantus?" But, for the sake of argument, let us take the assumption of Mr. Guess to be true, that all these means are equally efficient, and equally clear about the goal of man; let us assume that "experience" is the only thing that matters in the question of personal salvation. Even then the question would come back in another form, a capital question in religion: "Are all those religions yielding an equal amount of *glory to the Creator*?" And, "what is the religion in which I will be able to give to God the greatest possible glory?" All that talk about "thrilling experiences" as the test of religion, reminds me very strongly about another much abused word which is closely connected with the former, the word "love". The men who are or have been great in the world have always understood love to mean the surrender of the lover to the beloved, the complete sacrifice of one's own interest to the interest of the beloved. The centre of love was always outside the lover. But the "modern" world ("modern" Eastern and "modern" Western) has tried to force the meaning of that sweet and holy name. The centre of love has been displaced. The lover, no longer the beloved, is often the centre of love. The beloved is loved only for the sake of the lover himself. And the most selfish and beastly self-satisfaction often parades under the name of love.

THE GIFT OF LOVE

Once when the Earth was Young, Man Woman knew,
And Woman Man, as each the other's due,
Each breathing soul to each yet incomplete,
And Love the Paraclete.
But yesterday, there leaned a poisoned head
And whispered sneering,— "Such child's creeds are dead :
Love is but Sex, Sex Love. What man's flesh wills,
Filled full, his ends fulfils."
"Blaspheming snake ! " I said, " get whence you came !
Love is God's Thought : Love is as clean as flame.
And our Earth-love of this clear Flame is blent,—
Sex but the accident."
Great Lord of Love, that willed this Earth to be,
Keepest it quick, saltiest the heartening sea,
Swingest the punctual stars through cadenced space,—
Hear me for Love say grace.

—WILLIAM BLISS

It is the same in religion. The "modern" philosophers (East or West) no longer ask themselves: "How, where, can I love God most? What is the best way of showing Him my love? What is the Holy Will of my beloved God?"—No!—Many ask themselves: "What religion can give me the most thrilling personal experiences?" There is such a thing as the spirit of adultery in religion

(2) Catholics do not admit that one religion is as good as another, but they do admit that most religions are good. They can lead one at least a little way up the distant road which separates the infinite God from the finite creature. They hold aloft before the eyes of men a spiritual ideal, and challenge the spiritual forces in man to live up to it. Even if partly erroneous, those religions are better than no religion at all, at least as long as one is not conscious of any

* *The Month* — May, 1933.

error, for, consciously to call God by a false name is to blaspheme. It happens that men love God sincerely in spite of a definitely defective religion; this does not mean that one religion is as effective and as pleasing to God as another; it only shows that many human hearts are better than their own defective religion.

The danger of a defective or incomplete religion lies in the fact that it fills the soul with an ideal far below its own, and that it offers means entirely inadequate to the requirements of the true ideal. So it happens that the soul is filled with a weary disgust for religion instead of a keen and holy hunger for the true ideal.

(3) The Church has always admired the sublime heights to which the light of human reason has reached in the giants among the religious thinkers of both East and West. Catholicism believes that human reason, as such, is able to solve, at least partly, the great problems of the nature, origin and end of man which will always remain the subject of all great philosophy. In fact, we believe that the main lines of the philosophic problem are solved in the *philosophia perennis* in which men like Aristotle, Plato, Averroes, Samkara, Ramanuja, etc., find their fitting place. All that is healthy and lasting and great in the philosophies of East or West is not an objection to true Christianity. On the contrary it all witnesses to it. What should be understood once for all is the fact that Catholicism is not one philosophy opposed to another, not one *marga* or *sadhana* opposed to other *margas* or *sadhanas*, not the philosophy of wiser men opposed to that of men less wise. It is not the Catholic philosophers who have built up the religion of Christ. The most they did was to explain. Catholicism itself is not and never was a man-made philosophy. It is a God-sent-revelation! Catholicism as such cares little to proclaim the natural end of man whether *Brahma-nirvana Aikantya*, *Vaikuntha* or *Kailasa*; it does not claim to settle the question whether the natural end of man is (to speak only of India) the one put

forth by Buddhism, Jainism, Zoroastrianism, Islamism or Hinduism ; nor whether within Hinduism itself it is the *Nyaya*, the *Vaisesika*, the *Sankya*, the *Yoga*, the *Purva* or the various forms of *Uttara-Mimansa* which hold the true *purusartha* (true aim and therefore true beatitude of man) and the true *sadhana* to *mukti*. Christianity does not say that those systems are false. But Christianity as such does not wish to settle the disputes about the *natural end* of man precisely because its own message is something quite different from the *natural end* of man. Christianity proclaims that by the bountiful mercy of God man has been destined to a much higher goal than what we could naturally expect ; a goal which surpasses by infinity the highest speculation of men. The goal is not a human goal in God (the only one we have a right to by nature) ; the goal is super-human, divine. The vision will be the vision of supernatural salvation. We shall explain in this book in what supernatural salvation consists. Catholicism differs from any philosophy, from any natural religion in East or West, not in degree, but in its very essence. It belongs to another order of religion. It differs from any natural religion in its origin, in its purpose, in its way to the goal.

Catholicism is the *supernatural* religion of humanity. It is the God-revealed religion. Its unity and universality is not built on compromise, neither is it founded on addition or juxtaposition of parts. The Unity of Catholicism is the Unity of God-made-man in the person of Jesus Christ. It is not the resultant, but rather the principle of things to be ordered. The Unity of Catholicism is a ferment of life divine upon earth, it is the seed of the real world-fellowship of all the religions of humanity, as St. Augustine described it in the early Church Classic, *The City of God*, Book X., Ch. 32.

OPPOSITION TO TRUTH

Of course, we must expect opposition to the claim of Christ. It is always more easy to rally men against something than for something, especially when that "for something" is a well-defined message with clear-cut principles, and not a vague statement that cannot be attacked because it is so vague. Persecution was foretold by the Master. Truth has always been opposed in this world since the Fall, and Catholicism has always borne an ample share of the opposition to Truth.

Text books of history falsified, the manipulated news of the big news-agencies*, secret associations, enemies on principle as Bolshevism in Russia and Mexico, Liberalism in the West, or enemies because they do not know what Catholicism stands for — all these combine to test the worth of Catholicism.

Catholics are said to hold
that the world was made in six days of twenty-four hours each,
that Catholics are bound to hate non-Catholics,
that all non-Catholics will be damned,
that the Catholic Church claims the right to persecute,
that Catholics adore the Blessed Virgin,
that the Bible contains the whole of Christ's teaching,
that Popes cannot sin or are exempt from the duty of confessing their sins,
that Popes never did anything wrong,
that an indulgence is a licence to sin, obtained for money,
that Catholics must pay in confession so much per sin,
that nuns were walled up alive in convents,
that women are forced to enter convents against their own wishes,
that Catholics are disloyal to their country,
that the Church fosters ignorance,
that the Church opposes right liberty,
that the Church encourages superstitions.

3. England and India not excepted.

"Ridiculous!" you will reply; "no intelligent non-Catholic believes this kind of things nowadays!"

For answer we reply that a constant perusal of some intelligent non-Catholic periodicals will make you wonder how much of this type of nonsense has really been dispelled from even very intelligent minds. We do not claim that all Catholics have been saints, (though there were Catholic saints even at the most materialistic periods of European civilization), but we do claim that every religion (Catholicism included) has a right to be judged by its ideal, not by the behaviour of some of its members who have been weak, cowardly, unjust, etc., *in spite* of the ideal.

Still, we know that the best of India's leaders, those who know what it is to suffer for the Truth, cannot but love us for the stand for Truth which Catholicism makes in the world.

We have our beliefs and we preach them, we received our orders from Christ and we transmit them. And any government in the world could hammer at us till it was sick and we were pulp, and we would not obey if it were something against our beliefs and against these orders. Take the case of divorce. The government says "People can divorce". Let that be; but if government says "These two people are divorced, you ministers remarry them", then we say "They are not and we won't". And if we are sent to prison or fined for it, well, we go to prison and we pay. If King Henry VIII could come back, he might have some interesting stories to tell about this matter in proof of the above statement.

Birth-control is another example. Catholics reason like this: Either it is a moral process or it is not. If it is moral, then no one should object to it on moral grounds and then there is no reason why the process should not be called by its true name which is not birth-control but birth-prevention.

On the other hand, if the process is immoral, then we must have the courage to call it immoral in spite of the terrible propaganda in favour of birth-control

carried on at present under cover of half a dozen high-sounding labels. We Catholics call it an immoral process, and we know why and on what principles.

Catholics believe as much as anyone else in the power of the cinema, if it is used for real education or healthy recreation. But, if the cinema has to be defined as "a machine for unrolling certain regular patterns called pictures, expressing the most vulgar millionaire's notion of the taste of the most vulgar millions" (CHESTERTON); if the laws of decency be flouted or public trust betrayed, then a mighty voice will be heard challenging the big business of Hollywood in the name of decency, the nation's health and happiness. The latest challenge came from the Catholic episcopate of the United States and their flock (26 millions). Many other creeds rallied to the challenge and soon the "League of Decency" caused a big drop in the profits of the box-office; at least for once the stars of unchallenged Hollywood reeled under the shock.

It is the same with the spread of Catholicism. Catholics believe that truth has its rights in the world, and no dictator will ever be powerful enough to prevent Catholics from obeying the Master's command: "Go and teach all nations, baptizing them." In 1923, during the persecution of the Catholic Church in Russia (which has never ceased since), Krylenko, the government prosecutor said at the trial of Archbishop Cieplak and Monsignor Budkiewicz: "I spit on your religion as I do on all religions: on Orthodox, Jewish, Mohammedan and the rest." Then he asked the accused: "Will you stop teaching the Christian Religion?"

Answer: "*We cannot: it is the law of God.*"

Verdict: Guilty of death.

Take the case of modern Capitalism. Where is the big power in East or West which as far back as 1891 has dared publicly to launch a manifesto which challenged the magnates of the industrial revolution and which called the status of the workman little better than slavery? Pope Pius XI repeated the challenge of Leo XIII:

" In our days not alone is wealth accumulated but immense power and despotic domination is concentrated in the hands of a few.

" The immense number of propertyless wage-earners on the one hand and the superabundant riches of the fortunate few on the other, is an unanswerable argument that the earthly goods so abundantly produced in this age of industrialism are far from being rightly distributed and equitably shared among the various classes of men." (*Quadragesimo Anno*)

Take the case of the totalitarian State, for instance in Russia or in Germany. German Catholics were the most loyal patriots in the world. The Saar plebiscite was a clear proof. But they dared to disagree when the state began teaching and acting according to such principles as these :

" There is no such thing as freedom of conscience or freedom of thought. The state in its totality takes full responsibility for all thought and all life. To think differently from the state is to be a danger to the state. The state has the sole right to the entire man. The right of the state over him begins at his birth, when he becomes a national socialist. His parents are but representatives of the state and can be left in possession of him only on condition that they guarantee him a National Socialist education. If they will not do this, the state has a right to remove the child." (Extract from a Nazi official course of educational lectures.)

Adalbert Probst, head of the Catholic youth organization *Deutsche Jugendkraft*, Dr. Klausener and others were shot without trial because they dared to protest against this new faith of German neo-paganism. Yet the voices of protest were not silenced. The protest was renewed several times by Cardinal Faulhaber, the most patriotic German of the Great War. Nazism banned a letter of the German episcopate in which we find for instance the following sentences :

" We believe ", said the Bishops, " in a God, and that is not something human, bound up with one race or one blood. To-day in our country there exist false

prophets who deny the Divinity of Jesus Christ, who compel men to follow another faith than that which Jesus Christ taught by word and example."

"The neo-pagans", adds the Pastoral, "reject the Sacraments, and wish to substitute for the Grace of Jesus Christ the pretended mystery of the Nordic blood."

When neo-paganism conducts an intensive propaganda, the Catholic Press is no longer free to examine the problems of the day in the light of Catholic Faith and Morality.

"You have heard and read it stated", continues the Pastoral, "that morality consists in teaching the people what corresponds to the necessities and purposes of the race. We, who are your Bishops, tell you that morality is that which corresponds to the will and the precepts of God.

"You have read and heard it stated that you must take an oath of unconditional obedience. We tell you that, being an invocation of God, an oath cannot bind anyone to act against the precepts of God."

THOMAS MORE

These encroachments of the modern totalitarian state on the rights of human personality, human family, human thought remind us very strongly of similar circumstances under Henry VIII.⁴

On the 6th of July 1535, Thomas More went to his execution. Pride of Martyrdom was not there, neither indifference. In a few words to the people he asked them to pray for him and to bear witness with him that he should here suffer death in and for the Catholic Church. His last words to the people were still more precise :

4. Cf. *Thomas More* by DANIEL SARGENT, London, Sheed & Ward.

"I die loyal to God and the King, but to God first of all." His lips moved in prayer as he knelt on the scaffold of Tower Hill. He himself covered his own eyes, saying to the executioner: "Nay. I will cover them myself."

Says his biographer: "His eyes, which were so much his own, would be blinded by no other. Then the axe descended severing so appropriately that part of him which was so guilty, in a great confusion and perplexity, of having thought straight: his head."

THE FAITH THAT MAKES US FREE

All ill-informed people will tell you that the Catholic Church is conservative, that she always clings to armies, police or money-bags. True it is that Catholics obey any lawfully established authority whether republic, monarchy or what not, at least as long as it remains the lawful authority in the land (Cf. *Chapter on Culture*). True also that in her long history, a few Catholics (not the Church) may have succumbed to the frightful temptation of too much relying for help⁵ on the purple or silk of kings and emperors, but as a rule it has not been so ! As a rule the history of the Church has been one long struggle for the freedom of the spiritual conscience against coercion " from the days when Christians were massacred by hundreds of thousands for refusing to adore the Roman Caesar ; through the days when even Christian emperors thought they could dictate as to who was to be Bishop, who was to marry whom, and so on up to the days when kings tried to set up national religions which should be under their thumb and succeeded

5. The Ecclesiastical Department in Delhi has been mainly in the service of Protestant Christianity.

in England to a great extent ; on to our own days when the state tries to prevent us, for example, from teaching our children what we believe to be the most important thing of all in Catholic schools ”.

MARTINDALE

The upshot of all this is not that you should say at once “Amen” and become a Catholic. Without having found a foundation for your conviction you would not be received into the Fold. But you should resolve to know Catholicism for yourselves and not rely on the versions of text-books and news-agencies. “One cannot hate what one has understood.” So wrote the Philosopher Guyau. In any case it is well worth while knowing a body of 375 million men, organized as no other and scattered over every nook and corner of the world.

I am convinced, and I know from experience, that those Indian leaders, who come to know us, find us allies well worth having in the giant task of India’s moral, social, and religious reconstruction.

True, more often than not, we Catholics are to blame because we have “put under the bushel” or have dammed up in a narrow embankment, those Catholic tenets which are startling in their origin and startling in their far-reaching effects.

Catholicism is rich beyond all measure in just those principles which real India clamours for at this moment. Modernism is eating the heart out of what is most lasting in Indian thought. Who can stem that Modernism? Present-day immorality is threatening the men and women of a strong race. Capitalism is destroying ever more and more the villages of rural India, and even in towns is concentrating ever more wealth in the hands of a few. Is there no alternative then to Communism?

Indian art, Indian literature are but waiting for a great inspiring ideal which they will be able to serve.

Education does not know whither to turn for light.

An ideal is needed high enough and great enough to weld together the various leading cultures of India.

Could not light come from the age-long nation's building experience of Rome, which even today is more alive than ever?

"There is no post of vantage in the world's broad field of battle comparable to that of the Vatican", wrote W. T. Stead in the *American Review of Reviews*, August 1903.

Voltaire had prophesied that the Catholic religion would be dead within a couple of generations. The famous passage of Macaulay written several generations later, reads as follows:

"There is not, and there never was on this earth, a work of human policy so well deserving of examination as the Roman Catholic Church. The history of that Church joins together the two great ages of human civilization. No other institution is left standing which carries the mind back to the times when the smoke of sacrifice rose from the Pantheon, and when the leopards and tigers bounded in the Flavian amphitheatre. The proudest Royal houses are but of yesterday when compared with the line of the Supreme Pontiffs. That line we trace back in an unbroken series, from the Pope who crowned Napoleon in the nineteenth century to the Pope who crowned Pepin in the eighth; and far beyond the time of Pepin the August dynasty extends till it is lost in the twilight of fable.* The Republic of Venice came next in antiquity. But the Republic of Venice was modern when compared with the Papacy; and the Republic of Venice is gone and the Papacy remains. The Papacy remains, not in decay, not a mere antique, but full of life and youthful vigour. The Catholic Church is still sending forth to the furthest ends of the world missionaries as zealous as those who landed in Kent with Augustine, and still confronting hostile kings with the same spirit with which she confronted Attila..... nor do we see any signs which indicate that the term of her long dominion

6. He should have said till it is traced back to Peter who was constituted the foundation stone of the Church by Christ.

is approaching. She saw the commencement of all the governments and of all the ecclesiastical establishments that now exist in the world, and we feel no assurance that she is not destined to see the end of them all. She was great and respected before the Saxon had set foot in Britain, before the Frank had passed the Rhine, when Grecian eloquence still flourished at Antioch, and when idols were still worshipped in the temple of Mecca ; and she may still exist in undiminished vigour when some traveller from New Zealand shall in the midst of a vast solitude take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's."

The German historian, Dr. Adolph Harnack, wrote the following about Protestant Germany :

" I am convinced, from the constant experience of the fact, that the students who leave our schools have the most disconnected and absurd ideas about Ecclesiastical History, some of them know something about Gnosticism or about other curious and for them worthless details. But of the Catholic Church, the greatest religious and political creation known to History, they know absolutely nothing, and they indulge in its regard in wholly trivial, vague, and often directly nonsensical notions ; how her great Institutions originated, what they mean in the life of the Church, how easily they may be misconceived, and why they function so surely and so impressively : all this according to my experience is for them, apart from a few exceptions, '*terra ignota*', a region unknown."

HOW TO FACE GOD

Nothing else is necessary in reading this book except absolute mental sincerity towards Him who is more real than the air we breathe, more fundamental

than the soil we tread, more living and loving than sweetheart or mother.

Therefore the real rational and logical attitude when in search of God's Religion is the following :

(1) Abstain from *a priori*ism. It is wrong to take from the outset an attitude of mind that hinders all honest inquiry into the ultimate end and meaning of existence.

(2) But this is not enough.

If God is really a living and personal Being, then I cannot study Him as I would an impersonal subject as higher mathematics or chemistry. The honest and intelligent inquiry after God must of necessity take the form of a prayer as well as of a study. It is illogical and foolish to inquire into the problem of God with a mind at war against Him in order to see whether He can break down my defences and compel me to believe. Unhappily, Jaurez, doctor and prophet of French Marxism, is not alone when he writes these blasphemous words :

"But what we must safeguard by all means is this — that every idea which does not come from us is a lie ; even if God were to be made visible and palpable, if God Himself rose in visible shape before the crowds, the first duty of man would be to refuse obedience or to treat Him as an equal with whom one discusses on equal footing, not as with a master."

Jaurez, with so many others, forgets that he himself, not God, stands in need of salvation. A sincere inquiry into religion must of necessity take the shape not of "Shall I believe?" but of "May I believe?"

And to anyone who has the courage to pray to God for light whilst reading these pages, I venture to guarantee not necessarily thrilling experiences or religious sentimentalism (though Catholicism is famous for its numerous schools of healthy mysticism) but a telling conviction for life and an answer to the fundamental question of religion and morality which torments every man or woman worthy of the name.

LORD, Thou art Splendour,
 endow me with splendour ;
Thou art Force, give me force ;
Thou art Strength, make me strong ;
Thou art Energy, make me energetic ;
Thou art Indignation (against evil),
 infuse such indignation in me ;
Thou art Forbearance, make me forbearing.

YAJUR VEDA

Religion

the Whole of Man

GOD — ISWAR — ALLAH

WHEN SOME people hear that religion demands faith, they at once imagine that there is question of *blind* faith. Nothing is further from the truth. Man, being a rational creature, must proceed rationally in what he is to believe and do. Any religion, natural or revealed, must have a rational foundation. Now, the first rational foundation of any religion is God.

Great souls have racked their brains about that name. They had great desires and strong intuitions of the deep wonder of things. They had touched the Mystery of the universe before deliberately applying their reason. Soon their reasoning power also led them from nature to its cause, from the world to God. They realized that if all is mystery, it is only because there is one infinite Mystery from which all the others flow. This Mystery, the answer to every other mystery, the ultimate wonder, is God.

My purpose in this chapter is not professedly to prove the existence of God ; both scientists and philosophers are rediscovering Him ; it is rather to realize better what God is. Not a few are kept away from God by their wrong conception of God. What is God ?

Man takes too much for granted. He has lost his sense of wonder when looking at the universe. The din and roar of the present-day world of iron and steel

has captured his attention. Not only in many a town, but also in many a heart, the lamp posts of the street have outshone the stars of heaven. We boast of our speed records : glance at the sky at night and you will cease boasting. Saturn, for instance, rejoices in seven moons, and in the additional glory of two magnificent rings belting his heavens with a splendour inconceivable to us, and yet this planet, with its stupendous accompaniment of moons and rings, is rushing through space at the rate of 22,000 miles an hour.

We boast of great distances on this globe : look up and try, if possible, to imagine reality. Our own planet is 100 million miles distant from the sun. This is the first lap. The second leaves us on the outmost limits of our solar system 3,000 million miles away. At the next we reach out to the nearest neighbour of our sun, twenty million millions of miles distant ; and to the next nearest, sixty ; and to the next, 180 million millions of miles. We make these steps with certainty. The tremendous space is actually bridged over by the labours of the telescope and geometry. And now consider that this distance is only the blank which lies between two suns of our firmament that is composed of millions more, separated by the same awful abysses of night and solitude. How immense is the field occupied by the entire cluster, whose fractions are separated by such intervals ? And if 3,000 millions of miles separate the sun from one of its planets and twenty million millions of miles separate one sun from another, what must be the breadth of that nameless profound, which separates one firmament from another, which lies between those magnificent and mighty clusters of suns of systems, that, as the telescope is improved, rise into the field of vision, troop behind troop, rising for ever out of the fathomless depths of space ? Pascal said truly : "*Le silence de ces espaces infinis m'effraie.*" The silence of these immense distances fills me with awe.

What then of the countless hosts that people the infinite realms beyond, for ever beyond, the reach of the

telescope? The mind totters and reels with the thought, that all we can see, all these myriad suns and systems and clusters, dwindle into a point of light compared with what lies outside and for ever invisible to any possible human vision. God is greater than our speculations, and the multiplication table will not exhaust His creation, or exceed the immensity of His marvellous works. We may be oppressed, bewildered, overwhelmed in the attempt to grapple with these realities of the universe; but what are they to Him who holds them in being?

Truly we understand the religious enthusiasm of great scientists at the sight of such wonders:

Johann Kepler (whose rules formed the starting-point of modern astronomy): "I render thanks to Thee, Creator and Lord of the heavens, for all the gladness I have enjoyed in the soul-stirring ecstasies with which the contemplation of Thy works has filled me."

Sir Isaac Newton (who discovered the law of gravitation): "The regular motions of the planets and their satellites, their direction, their orbits, are a proof of foresight, and testify to the existence of an active cause, which does not work blindly and at random, but is clearly highly skilled in mechanics and geometry."

Sir William Herschel (who discovered the planet Uranus): "The further the field of science extends its limits, the more numerous and convincing are the testimonies in favour of an External Intelligent Creator."

Augustin Louis Cauchy (who contributed greatly to establish the undulatory theory of light): "I am a Christian with Tycho-Brahe, Copernicus, Descartes, Newton, Fermat, Leibnitz, Pascal, Grimaldi, Euler, Guldin, Boscovich, Gerdil, with all great astronomers, all great physicists, and all great geometricians of the past centuries,.....my religious convictions are not caused by the prejudices of early education, but the result of careful enquiries."

Urban Jean Leverrier, who directed the attention of astronomers to the point in the heavens where,

A few days afterwards, the planet Neptune was discovered, had a great crucifix placed in his observatory, and always respectfully greeted it, both on coming in and going out.

Louis Pasteur (who first applied heat to destroy germs): "You ask me how it is possible for me to believe, since I have studied so much. I answer it is just *because* I have studied so much that I have the faith of a Breton peasant; and if I had studied more I would have had the faith of a Breton peasant woman."

I have under my eyes a list of 124 famous learned men, in all branches of science, who in the last hundred years made an open profession of their belief in the Creator of the universe. Those who wish for more information on the topic 'what men of science say about God and Religion', I refer to the International Catholic Truth Society, 407 Bergen Str., Brooklyn, N.Y.

What is God? Before answering let us say a prayer to God that He may help us to realize something of what He is. Every monotheist can pray the *Fâtiha*, 1st *Surah* of the Koran (which dates back to the early religious experience of Mohammed), at which we too may prostrate with the Muslim: "Praise be to God, Lord of the Worlds! The compassionate, the merciful! King on the day of reckoning! Thee only do we worship and to Thee do we cry for help. Guide Thou us on the straight path, the path of those to whom Thou hast been gracious; — with whom Thou art not angry and who go not astray!"

TRANSCENDENCE OF GOD

God is the All-transcendent Being, the only One who necessarily exists; without beginning, without end. When asked His name by Moses, He answered: "I am who am" (Ex. iii, 14).

In fact, reason tells us that He is pure Being, pure Existence. The "that" and the "what" and the identity of both whom the Christian defines as : *Actus Purus* ; the Hindu : *Saccidânanda* : the Muslim : *Al Haq*.

With Samkara all men have to admit that on His own plane God's essence is absolute simplicity, and hence He cannot possess on His own plane a human body as the Hindu sectarians have held.

God is absolute simplicity of plenitude, not of abstraction. This transcendent fullness of divine unity and simplicity does not exclude life in God (He is the highest life) — in an analogous way as the unity and simplicity of our own soul does not exclude the activity of will and intellect. The Holy Trinity in Catholicism is nothing else but the supreme revealed mystery of the One, Unique God, understanding and loving Himself.

The whole universe rests immediately on God. God was, is, and remains, its Prime Cause. But He is not the *material* Cause of the universe as the clay is the material cause of the pot.

A personal God, being the absolutely free Cause of Creation, creates what He wills and how He wills according to an idea, a prototype ; being infinitely Wise, He creates with a purpose. God is the exemplary and final Cause of all that exists. He Himself is the inexhaustible prototype according to which all things in the vast universe have been freely created and are continually sustained. Anything existing besides God has been created by God out of nothing. That means that the whole substance of created beings, with all that they have, has passed from pure non-existence into existence through the power of God's holy will. The changes we know in the world, births and deaths, the rise and decay of beings, always suppose a pre-existing substratum. A child is born from pre-existing parents ; water can be made out of hydrogen and oxygen (H_2O). Creation on the other hand does not suppose any pre-existing material out of which things are made, or evolved. We are not emanations from

God, nor sparks of the Divinity, nor clay of the same substance. We *cannot* be. Creation has no material pre-existing substratum either in God or outside Him. God is its Creator, i.e. God called it forth out of nothing pre-existing by a mere act of His will. Samkara is right when he says that the world cannot add anything to God. On the other hand, Ramanuja, too, is right when he says that the world is real and distinct from God. The notion of creation out of nothing (as explained) is the only possible answer to this apparently insoluble puzzle.

Creation is not God limiting Himself. In the creature all is mere finite participation of the unparticipated One, and He Himself remains what He was, viz. absolute Being. Any perfection found in the creature is mere participation of the absolute Perfection found in God. God is like an ideal ray of sun which would contain in its pure whiteness all the colours of the rainbow, without being affected or diminished by them. God was, is, and remains, the transcendent and central Fact of the whole universe, whether the universe be viewed historically, physically or morally.

In order the better to realize something of God's transcendence let us put the question: How do we know God? The human mind can climb up with absolute certainty from the contingent and limited beings around us to the existence of a necessary and infinite Being, prime cause of all that exists. But in a sense this is only the outside of God. Our reason is not satisfied and longs to know what that Being is like within Himself.

The first thing which is evident is that God, as He is in Himself, is altogether outside the grasp of our natural faculties. Neither the whole nor part of God (if that were not a contradiction in terms) can be contained in, or expressed by, finite beings as they are. To say that God is naturally and immediately proportioned to our minds is to make of the absolute a finite thing. By the fact that God is the one necessary Being, He is also without common measure with all

that is not Himself, and He remains outside the reach of our most powerful efforts. Were God, as it were, constructed on the pattern of our own intellect, He would not be worth having. Yet our human intellect ever aspires after Him whom it feels to be the ultimate explanation of all things; but, when it turns to Him, it finds that it cannot face the sun but only its reflections on earthly things. The splendours of the pure Intelligible blind the eyes of us night-dwellers on this earth.

Is there no way then of knowing what makes all the rest intelligible? There is a double answer to this question.

On the one hand God is in some way the object of every act of knowledge. In fact, our intelligence is surrounded by signs, by reflections of the pure Light. Every tree or piece of rock, every friend, even the casual happenings of the day are a message from the great Unknown. Each time we understand something, we grasp something of God. Whatever we think and whenever we think, God is present in some way in our intellect, and therefore He is in some way the best known of all existing beings.

But we must at once add the other side of the question. Before the supreme Intelligible (God), if we can stammer many words, we must also and chiefly be silent and humble — because, in fact, what our unaided human intellect knows about the essence of God comes to nearly nothing. An Indian story narrates that the disciples of Samkara came one day to him and asked: "What is Brahma?" The great thinker was silent. Next day the disciples returned with the same question and again they received the selfsame answer. Several days elapsed in the same unsuccessful attempt, until the disciples asked Samkara: "Why do you keep silence when we ask about Brahma?" Then he answered: "Brahma is silence!" That man had realized something of God's transcendence.

What name can we give to Him who is nothing?
Whatever name we use is less than Truth.

SUNYA xiii, 145

‘ Shall we borrow finite features about us in order to express the Infinite? Impossible! Such a process might be possible where it is a question of finite beings. A blind man can form some idea of colour by means of his other senses; a feeble idea, true, yet an idea corresponding to reality. But how to express an infinite Being by means of features which are all finite? Even our highest concepts, as goodness, truth, etc., remain human and limited whatever be our efforts to purify them. Therefore we are not able to grasp a Being that *is* unlimited in being, truth, goodness, justice, mercy — which is super-being, super-goodness, super-justice and mercy.

What is to be done? Shall we ignore God? Impossible attitude! We reach constantly faint images of God. How could we ignore and grow indifferent towards Him? In spite of ourselves we remain God-seekers in the depth of our being.

MALGRE MOI, L'INFINIME TOURMENTE

Shall we simplify matters by treating God as a known being? Hopeless too! blasphemy! Without foundation to treat God as a known object would mean to destroy the very idea of God; or rather, to shape a finite concept which would be the exact opposite of His infinite Being. Is there no rest then for our souls tortured by the idea of a being that is pure Beauty, pure Happiness? Rational beings as we are, is it impossible for our human intellect to reach God's being on this earth? As we said above, the human mind cannot see God immediately. Medately, however, there is a way for our intellect of knowing something at least about God's being.

Consider the purest perfections in man — goodness,

truth, justice, etc. Apply them to God in the following manner: God *is* that perfection *but* without the imperfections and limitations which are necessarily connected in creatures with those perfections. Why? because the beings we know to possess those perfections have them always in a limited way since they themselves are essentially limited. Therefore, first deny the limitation in those perfections and then proceed. Increase and multiply that perfection not a thousand times but by infinity. God does not *possess* goodness, truth, justice. But He is unlimited goodness itself, unlimited truth itself, unlimited justice itself. He is all that, in one unlimited Being. Through the same process accumulate in God all possible greatness and perfection, shorn of their limitation and increased to a maximum point, and after all your efforts recognize that all those features are insufficient to picture the infinite essence of God.

Yet our efforts have not been in vain. For this humble confession of the insufficiency of our minds at this point of our reasoning is at the same time the supreme act of our intellect. It is the supreme homage of our minds to the greatness of God. It makes us surpass ourselves, and gives us, in fact, a less inadequate idea, true, as far as it goes, of the infinite Being: God.

At this stage of our reasoning we are like a man shipwrecked in mid-ocean. As long as he fights with the waves, he does not know what the sea is. It is only when, exhausted by the endless effort, he lets himself go on the great rhythm of the waves, that he realizes the vastness of the sea. It is the same with us. As long as we try to construct according to the above process the idea of God, we are surely on the safe road and we come ever closer to the true knowledge of God, but we do not grasp the full idea. The transcendence of God claims another homage. After all our efforts, our unaided mind must renounce the hope of ever understanding God, and without ceasing to tend to Him, give up all hopes of ever grasping the full idea. At this moment, in this supreme unlimited

act of the intellect, our finite mind reaches, in some way at least, the supreme Intelligible in the "hidden battlements of eternity". At this moment we know God, not as one among the many categories of being but as infinite Being Itself, of which we are merely finite participations. Act of supreme humility! of total homage of our intellect which, without understanding fully, recognizes that it is understood. This act is the religion of the finite intellect which adores in silence the Great Supreme. This act is the supreme act of our intellect. Through this act the mind realizes that the human mind itself is pure relation to the Absolute.

"L'homme n'est jamais plus grand qu'à genoux."

Man is never greater than on his knees.

I conclude: In the intellect of man, the religious activity is not a part, it is what is most fundamental, it is everything.

IMMANENCE OF GOD

We have seen that God is absolutely transcendent. This does not mean that God is far aloof from this world in a sterile egotism of His own. True, the world is absolutely distinct from God. Neither in space nor in time is there any common measure between God and man. The world was drawn out of pure nothingness, and God is from eternity the infinitely pure Being.

And yet God is present in the world. God acts in the world, and God, who is pure Spirit, is necessarily present where He acts. God lives the life of the world by giving the world life and being, whereas we live that life only by receiving it. Neither Samkara or Ramana nor Aristotle or Plato have ever conceived an immanence greater than this. In fact, they could not

do so, ~~not~~ having the notion of creation *ex nihilo*. We are much greater than our false pride would have us believe. In the world, in me, in you, there lives ~~not~~ only a mode of God, real or unreal, ~~not~~ only a particle of God but the whole of God.

At first sight we often imagine that the universe, with its wealth of minerals, plants, animals and men, was created once for all in far-away pre-historic times, but is now like a ship turned adrift on the high seas of the centuries, without any actual link with a far off Creator. This is a tremendous illusion. God *has not* created the world. He *creates* it. The whole universe is constantly related to God by an indestructible link. It exists owing to that essential relation to God, and for centuries the whole universe has been continually created and sustained simply because He willed it. Our eyes watch the heavens filled with stars or hidden behind spells of clouds. The brilliance of a dew-drop or the structure of a wing strike us with wonder. Yet all that would crash into nothingness the moment God ceased to sustain them in being.

Moses, the leader of the Jews, was amazed at seeing in the desert the burning bush, which continued to burn without being consumed. Was not that bush a figure of the entire universe which is for ever plunged in the divine fire of power and goodness?

"The day is drenched in Thee" wrote Francis Thompson, the mystic poet of English literature. And I venture to confess that the trees, the skies and the mountains have seemed different to me since the day I realized something of the staggering concept of a transcendent personal God immanent in Creation.

I conclude: The whole universe animate and inanimate, is constitutionally — and constantly — related to God. It is by itself a "lived" religion.

This homage to the Creator is stamped on every being. Minerals, plants, animals, etc., glorify God by the mere fact that they are. In man, endowed with intellect and free will, this homage must be conscious and free.

^a Note that the whole man is essentially related to God, not only his soul but *also his body*. Therefore, man's homage should bear the character of this double element of his being. His worship must be not only internal but also external. Besides, human nature and human psychology teach us that the spiritual homage is immensely helped by acts of external worship. Granted that a purely external religion is meaningless, a purely internal religion would be equally inadequate. Note also that man is not a mere self-sufficient individual in a world of his own. Man is essentially a *social being*, associated with and dependent on others. By nature, man belongs to human society and society belongs to God. Therefore, the religion of man, if it is to be really a religion for men, will have to bear social traces and express itself in some public or social manifestations of worship whereby God will be recognized as the principle and the goal of human society. Plato understood this when he wrote: "Religious worship is the first duty of the state." And men have always felt the same, for no great religion has ever existed without a sacrificial system, at the service, or in the name of, society.

It should be noted at this stage of our reasoning that religion is not merely a human phenomenon on the same level with art, literature and science. Neither is religion first of all an external law imposed by men or by books. Religion is the fundamental orientation of man to God. Religion is the new sublime expression, proper to our rational being, of that fundamental relation of every creature to the Creator. Religion is the whole of man. This is the meaning which St. Ignatius conveyed in the words: "Man is created to praise, reverence and serve God."

Animals are without intellect or will. They have no rational soul. Hence they live in a kind of constant somnambulism, driven by mere instinct and sensation. They cannot consciously *praise*, reverence and serve God. Man, too, has sensations and instinct, but ruling all these, he possesses a rational soul. Hence he can

reason and will. The religious act in man cannot be considered on the same level with other actions. The religious act is the highest act of the human soul. It is the human act *par excellence*, in which the very essence of our being is expressed. Therefore, religion must inspire and sustain all other actions and must be the core of the development of our whole being, spiritual, intellectual, corporeal, social, and international.

To exist is the first act of our worship. Our whole existence must be one act of worship. As the mountains and the oceans glorify the Creator simply by being what they are, so we, reasonable beings, by willing our life, by loving it because it belongs to God, and because God has made it ours, pay Him our homage.

Gratitude therefore ; but also due respect both for the immense sanctuary of the universe and for ourselves. But if religion is everything in man, it must express itself not only in the static sense of mere conscious existence but also in the dynamic sense of a mighty effort towards the Absolute. This dynamic aspect of religion takes hold of the whole man and of the whole universe through us.

"Un effort pour exprimer Dieu, c'est la plus haute définition du monde."—FR. SERTILLANGES

'An effort to express God', that is the highest definition of the world. Simply in order to keep their reality, minerals, plants, animals have constantly to hold fast to the First Cause. That is why with the whole weight of their inner being they are attracted to God much more powerfully than a stone and all its molecules are attracted towards the centre of the earth. Man himself is ruled by the same law. He, too, in order to keep his existence, is essentially God-centred. By constantly borrowing existence, he gravitates towards God, whether he wills it or not. But man, being intelligent and free, will be fully man only when he surrenders himself *freely* to Him who in a sense is the soul of his being, and yet is infinitely transcendent. In this sense we must all be *Muslims* in the

original sense of the word, that is, we must be men and women who are resigned and submitted to the will of God whenever that will is clearly manifest. But I would add : not only passively resigned but also actively. We must endeavour energetically to conform and square our moral acts with the divine law. But not only is our moral life to be subjected to God. The duty and dignity of human submission to God stands out in all its glory when man freely submits to His Creator, his body, his will and also his intellect, in case God clearly asks man to believe certain things which (without contradicting it) surpass human reason. God Himself, as we have seen, remains the great mystery to the human mind. The great passion in a rational man must be to do God's will in great things and in small, whatever be the cost. True devotion to the Will of God is an essential requirement for every God-seeker. Without this fundamental disposition, no man can be said to be truly religious. By trying to know and to do God's will man translates into a free and voluntary hymn that law of absolute dependence which is impressed on the whole universe. Nothing is more natural to man than to do God's will. It is the law of our being, the condition of our perfection, the pledge of our love of God.

RORATE CÆLI DESUPER
" DROP DOWN DEW,
YE HEAVENS "

A longing for God is the natural dowry of the human soul. Ever to aspire after God is the law of our being. Throughout the centuries, nothing has ever been able to kill that eternal longing of the soul for God.

" O that I knew where I might find Him ! " was the cry of Job in the ancient literature of Israel.

India has always prayed :

“ Lead me from error to truth,
Lead me from darkness to light,
Lead me from death to immortality ”;

and Rabia, the slave girl, prayed :

“ My God, my heart is a prey to perplexity
in the midst of the solitude.

* * *

I am a stone, so is Kaba.

What can it do for me ?

What I need is to contemplate Thy face.”

*Prabudāha Bharata*¹

Even whilst materialism rushes wildly over this fair land, we hear noble witnesses testifying to the same eternal longing for God.

“ What I want to achieve, what I have been striving and pining to achieve these thirty years is self-realization, to see God face to face, to attain Moksha.” — M. K. GANDHI, *Experiments with Truth*

And Rabindranath Tagore's sublime testimony is famous :

“ Day after day, O Lord of my life, shall I stand before Thee face to face. With folded hands, O Lord of all worlds, shall I stand before Thee face to face.

Under Thy great sky in solitude and silence, with humble heart, shall I stand before Thee face to face.

In this laborious world of Thine, tumultuous with toil and with struggle, among hurrying crowds shall I stand before Thee face to face.

And when my work shall be done in this world, O King of kings, alone and speechless shall I stand before Thee face to face.” — *Gitanjali*

And the ordinary people repeat the stanza of a Hindu poet :

*Sab ki vinay yah hai, Prabhuvar,
Apna māyā-jāl tor kar
Ek bār is avani-tal par
Ao, he Bhagavān.*

1. Aug. 1933. — article by Aga Syed Ibrahim.

It is the prayer of us all, O Lord,
That, tearing up the veil of illusion,
Thou mayest once come down
Upon this earth.

Now you may ask "What is the *raison d'être* of this mighty aspiration in the human soul? Powerful and sublime though this aspiration be, is it not a finite aspiration of a limited being? How then can it ever reach, much less measure, Him who stands in relation to nothing? Where is the point of possible contact and union between the finite and the infinite? Are we humans doomed to try for ever the impossible? Are we created for a state of unhappiness in which our whole being throws us constantly upwards, towards the inaccessible, always to fall back on our own limited strength, as the bird which beats its bleeding head against the iron bars of its cage?"

This Godward pull in our being is not planted in us in order that we may enjoy God's fellowship. Only God has a right to intimate fellowship with Himself. The whole purpose of this aspiration is to perfect man as he is (St. THOMAS, *Summa Theol.* 2/2, 81.7), and to confer on his whole being that moral elevation and nobility which God requires from him and which is essential to his perfection as a man. Man is not fully man without acting according to that tendency. The more man follows that aspiration in doing God's will, the more man is himself and the more he is free. Our supreme duty and happiness and the highest title of our nobility is to praise, reverence and serve God, to know Him and love Him in the mirror of creation.

We must confess that this happiness remains incomplete. When you have got only a picture of your mother, you do not fully experience the happiness of beholding her features and hearing the endearing words of her loving heart which she alone, not the picture, can express. In a similar way, the happiness of beholding and loving God in the mirror of creation can never satisfy us to the extent, that the happiness of beholding and loving Him as He is and as He knows

and loves Himself, will satisfy us in heaven. But such a supreme happiness would be infinitely above the capacities of our human faculties. Our mind can only climb up to God through creation. Without revelation, no one can go higher. Science can boast of wonderful progress during the last centuries. One thing it cannot do is to create life. Pasteur has proved this once for all. It is the same in religion. Man can, and has to, perfect his religion ever more and more. One thing he cannot do, and that is to create divine life in his human soul. God alone could do such a thing.

No one has a right by himself to a higher vision than the vision of God in and through the world. Neither science nor natural religion can make a finite being proportionate to the infinite, no more than a child in the street can be made of the same blood as the son of the king by a mere natural process.

It is possible, of course, that God freely bows down to us from His infinite height, and transfigures us and lifts us up in a mighty love towards His heart. But such a condescension, if it exists, would absolutely surpass our faculties, our merits, our rights.

GOD AGAIN

Up to now in our study of man's relation to God, human reason has been our guide. Our conclusion is that we, with the whole universe, are a crying need of, and aspiration towards, the Infinite. But we may ask ourselves whether that relation to God is merely a relation of nothingness to absolute power? To answer that question with certainty, the limited light of the human mind must be helped by a higher Light. God alone could answer and has answered that question: The relation between God and man is not

merely a relation of power, it is also and chiefly a *relation of love*.

From God's point of view, the primary aim of creation is the manifestation and glorification of God's goodness and love. The second aim is the good of creation itself and especially of man, the king of creation. God has created us, not to acquire anything which He had not before, but in order to communicate Himself. It is from the eternal love of Him whose definition is "Love" (ST. JOHN) that the world has come into being. Everything that exists is an act of God's own love, made tangible; it exists because, and in the measure in which, God loves it. It is by the undeserved, gratuitous love of God that you and I exist at this moment. Therefore, from God's point of view, Creation is a child of love; from man's point of view, Creation has to be a glorification of the Creator. By glorifying God and so loving Him, man will fully realize himself as man. The real good of man and the glory of God are, in the plan of God, identical. Religion is nothing else but being loved by God, and never forgetting it — to love God in return. We will see gradually all that love implies both on the part of God and on the part of man.

We have just seen that man, by nature, has no right to the vision of God *face to face*.

GOD'S LOVE

And yet, in His supreme condescension God has conferred that right on man. By a free gift of His love, God has destined all men from the beginning to such an intimate fellowship with Himself, that one day we shall be able to see and love God as He sees and loves Himself. As man is absolutely^e incapable of ever reaching such a goal, God had cast into the

soul of our first parents " sanctifying grace ", that divine power which alone could transfigure and adapt us to the vision of God face to face for all eternity. This gift made of our first parents in truth and not only in name a true son and a true daughter of God. So great was the gift of sanctifying grace, that from the beginning it was the supreme reality in the universe, and all the rest of creation had been made merely a substratum for this pledge of love and glorification of God.

The Book of books teaches us that it was Adam, the first man, the father of the human race, the one being who by God's disposition bore within himself the whole human race with all its possibilities and powers, who had thus been raised from the close and narrow prison-house of his own nature into the wide expanse of divine life ; and because of this gift of God, concupiscence, suffering and death were removed from his existence. It was as a perfect man that Adam came into the world, as a man of complete interior harmony and stability, as a man of absolute beauty and happiness, as a superman in the best sense of the word : as a child of God. But the loving God in His extreme respect for us did not want to force us to come to Him. Together with the gift of grace, He had given us the gift of freedom of will, in order that man might have the honour of being himself, in a sense, the free author of his own sublime destiny of happiness and glory. God rightly claimed man's complete self-surrender, (SAMKARA), were it only for the reason that God had first surrendered Himself to man (and this Samkara has not seen). In spite of nothingness, God had treated man, a mere creature, as a mother treats her babe, or rather He had done infinitely more ; for however poor he be, a mother will always idealize her babe in her heart and in her mind. But this idealization remains merely subjective and inefficient. Whilst God's idealization of man was objective and efficient, it was the cause of sanctifying grace. Man had only to co-operate freely with grace.

THE FALL

But man abused that freedom. In the glamour of that first exuberant creation, our first parents found God so abstract and the creatures so lovable. They forgot that the whole creation was only a sign-post pointing to heaven. The rest of the story we know : it is the story of every sin ; Adam stopped at the creature and preferred it proudly to his Creator. In other words, he committed the first sin in the world. Adam, the father of the human race, *sinned*.

The shallow modern world shrugs its shoulders when you mention the word "sin". The headlines of leading papers and "famous" pictures have advertised so much "follow nature and impulse at all times", that to the great joy of big business the "old prejudice" is fast becoming obliterated in the hearts of young men and young maidens. But there is not only the sin of immorality ; *the* great sin is the sin against charity and justice. Some people observe a high standard of morality in their individual relations, who in social relations lack an awakened conscience. Their attitude towards questions relating to caste, class, community, race and nation is most un-Christian and anti-God. Too often moral progress lags far behind material progress. It is sinful to a new social and economic order. Now, whether the "modern" world believes it or not, these sins too are a daily fact, and sin is the evil of creation as it is our own evil. However much Vivekananda may proclaim that it is a calumny to say that any human being can be guilty of sin, the whole experience of humanity is there to contradict him. The great God-seekers of India have deeply felt the disorganization of the world through sin. They have traced the world disorder to the *rajas* and *tamas* which are the poisonous flowers of selfishness and sin. *

2. We cannot admit the metaphysical *māyā* of Samkara, but we do admit a moral *māyā*, viz. our selfishness which ever tries to imagine that we are independent of God.

Already in the *Rig Veda* we find this attitude deeply emphasized :

Let me not yet, O Varuna, enter into the house of clay :

Have mercy, Almighty, have mercy.

If I go along like a cloud drawn by the wind,

Have mercy, Almighty, have mercy.

Through want of strength, Thou strong and bright God,
have I gone to the wrong shore :

Have mercy, Almighty, have mercy.

When we men, O Varuna, commit an offence before
the heavenly Host,

When we break the law through thoughtlessness,

Have mercy, Almighty, have mercy.

—BK. I, HYMN xxv

“ Loose me from sin, as from a bond that binds
me. ” — BK. II, HYMN xxviii

“ Verily I ask pardon of God and turn from sin
towards Him, more than seventy times a day. ” —
The Mishkat-ul-Masabêh X, Ch. iii

As perfect charity is the love of God even to the contempt of self, so mortal sin is self-love even to the contempt of God (ST. AUGUSTINE). It is a deliberate act whereby, in a serious matter, with full knowledge and full deliberation we choose our own will above the will of God. When a man sins, he turns away from God, and by the very fact mutilates himself, because he breaks, as it were, the most intimate law of his being which is God-centred. By so doing, the sinner — not God — fixes himself in a state of rigid ugliness and pain like a pillar of iron which has gone crooked. Hence, it is clear that an act against the divine order turns out to be against ourselves either in this world or in the next or in both. And if, whilst in that state of sin, the body drops away, the principle of change disappears in us, and we remain fixed for ever in that state of rigid aversion from God which we freely chose. Hell will primarily be nothing else but the ultimate and full realization of selfishness where men, created to love God for all eternity, are frustrated for ever of the object of their Love. Through sin and selfishness

hell yawns within us. Hell is the absence of God from man as far as that is possible. God is not mocked.

But in sin there is worse than all the physical pain and suffering which follow in its wake ; there is moral guilt, the bad will of man turned against his Creator. It is the will of man which deliberately chooses a creature and projects upon it, as it were, the ideal of his ultimate end which can be only God. Such an act on the part of man involves an infinite insult against his Creator. Through this guilt, man, who is nothingness in the eyes of God, becomes positively worthy of dislike.

Such, too, was the guilt and ruin of Adam's sin. But in his case it was still worse. For his sin became, in a sense, the (not personal) sin of human nature ! How is that possible ? This leads us to the abyss of the divine decrees. This much is certain that men do not stand before God and in God's scheme of redemption as isolated individual beings ; they are essentially all one society. The whole of the human race is one idea of God realized in multiplicity on account of the essential infirmity of creatures. In that essential unity of the race, God sees, leads, directs, rewards and punishes us. When God created Adam, He at the same time created all of us in Adam's seed. God created us all in a natural and supernatural common destiny with Adam. Mankind is nothing else but the expansion in history of the first man.

Now, this first man turned away from God as far as he could without falling back into nothingness. And in him the whole of mankind was turned away from God. The endless train of suffering, concupiscence and death which followed in the wake of that sin was nothing compared to the guilt which original sin implied. This guilt it was which drove out of the human soul that pledge of the Great Vision face to face — sanctifying grace. With the loss of sanctifying grace, mankind lost for ever the very possibility of following up the high calling to which God had invited them. Since that first sin, the nature to which man

is born is a fallen nature, a nature estranged from God, stained by that lust to which Adam and Eve yielded.

Let us not be too hard on the sin of our first parents, for each time we have pandered to our distorted nature, the guilt of our nature (original sin) has become a personal guilt. If we examine our consciences in right earnest before God, who is the man who dares plead innocent of all guilt? When we search our souls in the light of God, shall we not find that we, too, at times have been gamblers with Truth, Justice, Charity? Besides the sins which all men at once notice such as adultery, theft, murder, broken vows, there are numerous other grave sins which are too easily passed over as trifling matters. Yet each time we have sinned, we have broadened the gulf between God and ourselves.

GOD'S MERCY

Both original sin and our own personal sins have stretched immense deserts between God and the human race; endless fields of ruins so sad that heart and feet shrink from returning from their downward course. Deep as the ocean is our nothingness and sinfulness, yet sky-high remains the impulse of our soul.

Are we lost then? Are we doomed to an endless cycle of births and re-births? Are we chained in black despair to a merciless *Karma-Samsāra* for time and perhaps for eternity?

If God were only Justice — Yes: Man can never stride by himself the abyss between God and himself. No man can ever redeem through his own efforts the guilt of a single sin. God is and remains Justice, but He is also and chiefly *Love*. He has created a world not of strict justice, but of mercy, and mercy is the

highest love because it is love bestowed on one who is positively unworthy ;— and so are we all.

The fall of the first man and woman has not checked the plan of God. This plan goes on in spite of original sin. Only, our fallen race, bent down under the weight of the physical disorder of sin, can now realize God's plan mainly through painful effort and suffering, which, without original sin, would never have oppressed us.

The world of Power and Love has grown into a world of unbounded Mercy.

What has happened? Who or what has brought about this transformation from death to life? From nothingness and sin to Grace and eternal Life? God Himself crossed the frozen fields of selfishness and sin in search of the lost sheep. (We refer to the next chapter.) One day a Man was to be seen on this earth, the most beautiful of men, divinity shining in His face and His whole Being — and that Man was God. He was the "revelation of the mystery that was kept hidden from all eternity" (ROM. xvi, 25). And throughout the centuries, He stands before "every man that cometh into this world," waiting only for a repentant look, for a loving heart. If we but will, He, the Christ, will take us unto His own, and speak the word He spoke before the bier of the young man of Naim: "Young man, I say to thee: arise!"

THE GOOD SHEPHERD

Shepherd, who with Thine amorous sylvan song
Hast broken the slumber that encompassed me, —
That mad'st Thy crook from the accursed tree,
On which Thy powerful arms were stretched so long!
Lead me to mercy's ever-flowing fountains;
For Thou my Shepherd, guard, and guide shalt be;
I will obey Thy voice and wait to see

Thy feet all beautiful upon the mountains.
Hear, Shepherd !— Thou who for Thy flock art dying,
O, wash away these scarlet sins, for Thou
Rejoicest at the contrite sinner's vow.
O, wait !— Yet why ask it when I see,
With feet nailed to the cross, Thou'rt waiting still for me !
— LOPE DE VEGA

Where will He lead us?— To the Father ! How?
— From this time onwards He desires to make us sons
and daughters of God. It is of little import that man
call God his Father ; it is of the utmost import that
man have the *right* to call God his Father in deed and
in truth. The God-revealed religion of the Christ
(Cf. next chapters) will chiefly consist, not in preaching
a new message but in conferring a new right : the right
of sonship of God. That right is conferred through
sanctifying grace in Holy Baptism.

And at the hour of death, when our eyes begin to
open on the horizons of the invisible, will He be faith-
ful?— He will. Death cannot break our sonship
of God. On the contrary, it will blossom forth at
that hour in all its splendour.

BEATIFIC VISION

My soul shall find in heaven what it has been
looking for in thousands of objects here on earth. My
soul shall rest in that happiness and joy of which all
the God-seekers on earth have dreamt or sung. In
spite of appearances, modern men thirst for it as keenly
as St. Augustine, 1500 years ago :

“ Thou, O God, hast made us for Thyself and our
hearts are restless until they rest in Thee.”

Long centuries before, the Psalmist had exclaimed :
“ As the hart panteth after the fountains of water ;
so my soul panteth after Thee, O God. My soul hath

thirsted after the strong living God ; when shall I come and appear before the face of God ? ”

St. John of the Cross sings in his “ Spiritual Canticle of Love ” :

“ Reveal Thy presence and let the vision of Thy beauty fill me.

Behold, the malady of love is incurable

Except in Thy presence and before Thy face.”

Ramanuja's conception of the *antaryāmin* is also a sublime aspiration after that grand Reality. Unhappily Ramanuja could only have a glimpse of that Reality owing to the pantheistic background of his philosophy. Fellowship is of two. If we disappear in God, there can be no question of fellowship. If, truly, we are only emanations of the Great Fire (God) co-existing on the same plane — mere sparks which from eternity have lost their God-consciousness — in that case *mukti* will consist only in returning from the unnatural condition of *samsāra* to our God-consciousness. In that case we have always been and never ceased to be God. In that case matter and the whole material world are the enemy, because the soul was never meant to be world-conscious and to have a body. Hence, Hindu asceticism logically consists in liberation (getting rid of the blinding effect of matter) not in progressive realization. In the descriptive words of Fr. Johannis : “ Salvation is a mere regress to what we are and never ceased to be ; it is not a progress to what we are not yet. It is not a self-transcending process, but only a self-regaining process.” Besides, surrender of ourselves which leads to annihilation is not a human surrender.

“ If,” says Fr. Johannis, “ we wish to have a full idea and to gauge the summit of the Beatific Vision, we must first descend to the very bottom of our nothingness, to the origin of our nothingness. If we look at God without moving away from Him, we are bound to get a blurred view of Him where the finite and the infinite remain mixed up, and where the line of partition is no longer visible.”

In the Catholic concept of the Beatific Vision, the Divine mercy and love stand out in all their glory.

From the free and loving heart of God we received first our existence which was not due to us — secondly, forgiveness of sin which was absolutely gratuitous — and finally, new life (sanctifying grace) which is the seed and pledge of the Beatific Vision for all eternity. Hence, Catholic spirituality logically consists in action and progress. Disorder, and not matter, is the enemy. We want to *save* our body, to *save* the world, not destroy it. Excessive love of the world cannot be expunged by a mere demonstration of the world's worldliness, but it can be supplanted or, at least, ruled by that which is more worthy than itself.

God becomes present within a baptized soul by transfiguring the intellect so that man is able to see God as He sees Himself, — by transfiguring the will so that man is able to repose in God as He reposes in Himself, — by transfiguring the heart so that man is able to love God as He loves Himself. God's grace enables us to transcend our human nature. Through grace, God is not only present in us by making us present to ourselves (continual creation) but by making Himself present to us and thus divinizing us. Allow me an illustration from my own experience.

I was motoring up the Ghum Road in the Himalayas on my way to Tachda on the Kalimpong Road. It was one of those bracing November days when not a speck breaks the harmony of a deep-blue sky and when the valleys look deeper than usual, as if trying to reflect in their bosom the immense abyss of the Himalayan skies.

"Deep calleth to the deep."

Till we reached Ghum, we saw very little of the snow-peaks and we imagined that the view of the famous range was still far off. But suddenly, at the sharp turn of the road, my eye caught sight of the immense circle of white giants, stretching in mighty waves from beyond Kinchinjunga in Nepal, along the Wall of Tibet right into Bhutan, a solidified ice-range of

several hundred miles ablaze with white shining light, the right hand of India pointing to heaven. It took my breath away, and, deeply moved, I gazed on those white battlements as on the threshold of heaven. Instinctively I joined my hands in prayer, for I knew that God was near.

And yet what a poor experience, what a miserable sight, compared with the day when at the turn of the road of life we shall gaze on God face to face. Looking on the Himalayas I gazed only on His handiwork, a speck in the universe. One day we shall see Him face to face and all creation in Him. It is not in our light that we shall see Him but in His Light — the Light which is self-illuminating. We shall be conscious of God as He is conscious of Himself.

We shall gaze at, and listen to, God, — speaking, singing, -shining within Himself, in eternity: the great glory.

From the infinite abyss of nothingness and sin where the cries of man are scarcely heard, all men are destined, if they but will, to this fellowship of man with God. And if we take to the God-appointed means, you and I can have the absolute certainty that God loves us as His children, and destines us to be heirs to His perfect glory and perfect happiness.

Dante, inspired by a passage of St. Augustine's *Civitas Dei* (Bk. 22, Ch. 30), wrote in his *Paradiso* (Canto III, 1 sqq.):

“Nay tell me, ye, who here live happily,
Do ye desire a higher place in bliss
Where ye may see more, also make more friends?”
She smiled a moment with the other shades,
And then replied so cheerfully to me,
That she seemed all aglow with love's first flame:
“Brother, our will has been composed by that
Virtue of charity which makes us live
For what we have alone, and not besides.
Should we desire in higher state to be
Our wills no more would move in harmony
With that great Will of Him who placed us here,

A thing impossible in climes like these,
Where life in love is our necessity ;
And if its nature Thou investigate,
The principle of blessedness is this,
So that, as we are ranked from grade to grade
Through all the realm we all are satisfied
Just as the King, who bent us to His Will.
That Will Divine is man's tranquillity ;
It is the sea to which creation moves."

GOD, who, at sundry times
and in divers manners spoke, in
times past to the Fathers by the
prophets, last of all, in these days
hath spoken to us by his Son.

HEB. 1, 1, 2

Jesus Christ

CHRIST & THE CRITICS

IT IS not the purpose of this book to prove the historicity and authenticity of the Gospels. All this has been done so often and so thoroughly, that I satisfy myself with referring to scholars like, Batiffol, Lagrange, Allo, Huby, Durand, Jacquier, D'Arcy, Lebreton, Lattey, to mention only a few.

Some of the latest works on Christ are given here :

1. "*Jésus Christ*" : LEONCE DE GRANDMAISON, S.J., translated from the French ; London, Sheed and Ward.

2. *Où en est le problème de Jésus ?* : FRANÇOIS-MARIE BRAUN ; Librairie Lecoffre, J. Gabalda, Paris.

3. *The Son of God* : KARL ADAM ; translated from the German ; London, Sheed and Ward.

4. *Christ and the Critics* : HILARIN FELDER ; translated from the original German by John L. Stoddard ; London, Burns Oates & Washbourne.

5. *Jésus et l'Histoire ; La Personne de Jésus ; Jésus, Lumière du Monde ; Jésus le Messie ; Jésus Messie le Thaumaturge et Prophète ; Jésus, Fils de Dieu* : all these works are by PINARD DE LA BOULLAYE, S.J.

For a host of smaller works in pamphlet form, I venture to direct you to :

THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY,

38/40 Eccleston Sq., London ; and the

INDIAN CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, Trichinopoly.

The best apologia for Catholicism is simply to give a description of the historical Jesus Christ and of His Great Plan for Man and for the World. The best contact with Catholicism is the personal contact with

Jesus Christ. Peter had it when he made his great act of Faith and adored Him.

Before giving here the picture of Jesus as a whole, as it is found scattered throughout the four Gospels, I should like to point out the following :

1. The time when Jesus lived is one of the best known to us in ancient history. This can be said for the present, that in spite of — or rather owing to — the research of modern criticism, Christ stands forth under the gaze of the world more true (if possible) than ever ; like the firmament when examined with the powerful instruments of modern Science.

The scholar Léonce de Grandmaison, in his book *Jesus Christ, His Person, His Message, His Credentials*, begins with the following preliminaries :

“ Unlike Buddha Sakyamuni, Jesus did not come into the world during a period half-known, in which history and legend dispute over names and facts ; nor was He born, like Mohammed, in a remote district of Arabia. The Jewish world of the first century, particularly the Palestinian world, is well-known to us ; its national vicissitudes, its complex political system, the flow of ideas and influences within its borders, all are in the full light of history. Its immediate surroundings, too, are an integral part of ancient civilization in one of the most brilliant and best known periods. To the old texts, which are somewhat literary in character, have been added in recent years the thousands of intimate writings which the sands of Egypt have yielded up to us. And at the same time and in almost equal measure, archæological knowledge grows by reason of the methodical exploration carried out by the schools, and the scientific missions which have divided amongst themselves Greece (both continental and insular), Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, and Persia.

“ Born under the rule of Augustus, and dying under that of Tiberius, Jesus was the contemporary of Philo the Jew, of Livy, and of Seneca the Philosopher. Virgil, if he had lived to the normal age, might have seen Him, while Nero, Flavius Josephus, Plutarch and

Tacitus belonged to the generation which immediately followed Him.

" Many others are well-known to us amongst those who figure in the history of the origins of Christianity. The high-priests Annas and Caiphas, the rabbi Gamaliel (the former master of St. Paul) ; Herod the Great, his son Herod Antipas, his grandson and great-grandson, Herod Agrippa I and II ; Pontius Pilate and all those who, before and after the fleeting rule of Herod Agrippa I (41-44), succeeded him in the office of procurator of Judæa. So, too, we know intimately Gallio, the brother of Seneca, Proconsul of Achaia in 51-52 ; John the Baptist, and his disciples Simon Peter and John ; James of Jerusalem and Saul of Tharsus ; and many other personages whose activities are manifested to us by a multitude of concordant witnesses.

" The person and the work of Christ thus fit in, in their own time, with the working out of a historical plan, the continuity of which is proved. There is nothing of the nature of a vague figure about Him, nothing of the mythical or legendary type, as in the case of an Orpheus, an Attis, or a Krishna. Jesus is a real man whose public appearance is firmly dated by means of an impressive synchronism : ' Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judæa, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and Philip his brother tetrarch of Iturea and the country of Trachonitis, and Lysanias tetrarch of Abilina, under the high priests Annas and Caiphas, the word of the Lord was made unto John, the son of Zachary, in the desert. . . . ' ¹

" Of the Master thus located many texts speak to us, offering us, together with the geography, the religions, the institutions, the literature and the customs of a definite period, innumerable details. A compact group of the faithful, many of them powerful in speech and in

1. Luke iii, 1-2. On the details of this synchronism and its precedents amongst the Greek historians, see A. WIKENHAUSER, *Die Apostelgeschichte und ihr Geschichtswert*, Munster i. W. 1921, pp. 143-146.

works, give themselves to Him unconditionally, openly professing that only by Him do they go to God ; and a whole world of particular beliefs, and a liturgical cult gifted with a prodigious force of expansion, has reference solely to Him. Now between this spiritual blossoming and the God whom it proclaims, not as an ideal or a symbol, but as a living person and as a fact, there is no longer thought to stretch the century which David Frederick Strauss postulated when he wrote his *Life of Jesus*, nor even the half-century demanded by others. Twenty-five years after the date assigned by all to the violent death of this man 'under Pontius Pilate',² certain authentic and relatively considerable writings, the letters of Paul, take for their fundamental theme Jesus of Nazareth, His life and His death. 'A short life of Jesus', wrote Ernest Renan in the last chapter of his last book, 'could be made from the Epistles to the Romans, to the Corinthians, and to the Galatians, and also from the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is not by St. Paul, but is certainly very ancient';³ and this is very evident.

"This first authentication permits us to pass over the preliminary question concerning the historical existence of Jesus ; but it does not dispense us from studying profoundly the sources of His history, which naturally divide into Christian and non-Christian. These must now be our study."

I would advise any historian who wishes to study these sources to read de Grandmaison's work.

2. I should like for the future to warn the reader when he takes up popular papers or reviews about the subject of Jesus Christ. People have been at pains to falsify history with regard to the God-Man.

Tremendous indeed are the consequences for our moral conduct, should it be proved that Jesus Christ is God. In the words of Merejkowski: "The thief

2. On this, see the monograph by G. BALDENSBERGER: *Ila rendu temoignage sous Ponce Pilate*. Strasbourg, 1922.

3. *Histoire du Peuple d'Israel* V, Paris, 1894, Ch. XVIII, p. 416, note 1. Renan dates *Hebrews* "about the year 66" "before 70"; see *L'Antichrist*, Paris, 1873, p. xiii, *passim*.

requires that there should be no light ; the world requires that there should be no Christ."

If some proposition of geometry involved a moral obligation, it would long since have been denied. What are we to say then of a person who challenges the conscience, the heart, and the mind of every man "that cometh into this world"? If Christ is what He proclaims Himself to be, viz. God-Man, then you have no right any more to be a pessimist or a relativist or a sceptic, in religious or moral matters. On the other hand, if Christ be merely a sublime idea struck from a human brain (and what brain? it takes a Jesus to invent Jesus), then He has no historic reality, and hence no right to claim uncompromising devotion and a perfect moral conduct.

Whenever we look among the so-called liberal or critical Christologies, we find at the outset of their inquiry that dogma of *a priori* unbelief which Renan expressed in the words: " Il n'y a pas de surnaturel ! " In this world there is no supernatural reality.

The most rational attitude when in search of truth, especially when in search of God, transcendent Truth Itself, is to study dispassionately and humbly and to join to intensive study a fervent prayer to the God of Light. Then we shall not exclude from God *a priori* the possibility of His revealing Himself to man in the way He chooses and thinks best, even if it goes against our expectations.

In the picture we are going to draw we cannot claim perfection, but we do claim that it is correct as far as it goes. *There is not one feature given in this picture of Christ, which is not based on genuine, often numerous, texts from the Gospels and from St. Paul.*

A number of writers (we will not call them critics) have appealed in the past to the syncretic theory in order to explain Jesus Christ. They have constructed the most contradictory theories. But strange to say, they have been destroying one another like the Kilkenny cats who " ate each other up " ; so with the critics of the Higher Foolishness ; they have destroyed one another, and nothing is left but the harm they have done,

and are doing, thanks to what Carlyle called "the damnable attractiveness of error". As Paulus refuted Reimarus, and Strauss refuted Paulus, so Renan refutes Strauss (*Life of Jesus* 1863).

As far back as 1868 Louis Jacolliot (in his book *The Bible in India*, and in many other writings) tried his best by hook or by crook to trace the origins of Christianity to Buddhism. These writings were received with enthusiasm by the half-learned crew of the modern world, whilst the scientific reviews refused even to mention them. Max Muller mentioned the concoctions of Jacolliot as the "type of false analogies". See *Introduction to the Science of Religion* (1873), p. 319 ff. Yet this book was exploited by a man like Dr. Marius (*Die Personlichkeit Christi*, Leipzig, 1879), and later still by Th. J. Plange (*Christus ein Inder?* Stuttgart, 1907), and finds still more than one echo even at present in some reviews of Hindustan.

A Russian journalist, N. A. Notovich, wrote a best-seller in his novel *Vie inconnue de Jésus Christ*, 1894, where he tried to prove that Jesus had passed 16 years with the Brahmans and the Buddhists under the name of Isa, and he published a faked Indian document. Farquhar in his *Modern Religious Movements in India* gives a full description of the fraud. Yet you will still find reviews mentioning it as genuine without any fear for their own name.

I add one more example which is less known. Pinard de la Boullaye in his *Etude comparée des Religions* mentions it on page 505 of Vol. I (3rd ed.).

In 1911 there was published at Leipzig a letter of Benan (*Ein Jugendfreund Jesu.....*, Brief des Aegypt, ARTZES BENAN ... in 8°, Leipzig, Pichler, 1911).

According to that document Benan was a doctor and a priest at Memphis. A contemporary of Jesus, this priest had told a friend how the Jewish child Jesus was educated at Leontopolis in all the riches of Egyptian learning, how at the age of twelve He had returned to Jerusalem where He had a brilliant dispute with the scribes of His own nation, how He had returned to Hiero-

polis in order to complete His studies. There Jesus would have practised medicine with great success, interviewed Philo of Alexandria, and on the instigation of the Jewish priest, Pinephas, made up His mind to become a doctor and a healer of His compatriots. Benan, so goes the story, met Christ again on the day of His Passion and was among the disciples of the days of Christ's Resurrection and last recommendations. So far the document.

A special library was founded to exploit this document; a swarm of theosophists, occultists and free masons exalted to the skies its extraordinary value, until a Coptic scholar, Dr. C. Schmidt, (in *Der Benanbrief*, in 8°, Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1921, p. 95. TU, t. xlv, fasc. 1) exposed this shameful travesty of history.

The letter of Benan is a piece of fraud composed with words borrowed from the Egyptologist F. J. Lauth of Munich, and with the help of the novelist E. E. von der Planitz.

Allow us once more to warn the reader against current falsifications of the one historic Christ.

I wish to finish with a note of Fr. de Grandmaison. Let us merely note that our actual printed Greek text of the New Testament enjoys in regard to the text of every ancient author, sacred or profane, a privileged position. Whether we consider the number of the manuscripts or the period of time which separates the oldest of these manuscripts⁴ from the actual autograph,⁵ or whether we consider the number and age of the versions, or the extent and solidity of the critical work expended on their texts, no comparison is possible.....

4. The Chester Beatty MS. recently found dates from the 3rd century. There are thousands of existing MSS. besides; many of them very old. ..

5. Most of these earliest witnesses wrote or started writing long before the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 (Paul's first epistle to a Christian community was written in 51) when the facts related were still present in everyone's mind and could be checked by friends and foes.

Furthermore, Hort, the most exact and the surest of textual critics of the nineteenth century, summed up as follows the memorable investigation made through twenty-five years by his colleague, Westcott, and himself: "The proportion of words virtually accepted on all hands as raised above doubt is very great, not less, on a rough computation, than seven-eighths of the whole. The remaining eighth, therefore, formed in great part by changes of order and other comparative trivialities, constitutes the whole area of criticism. The amount of what can in any sense be called substantial variation is but a small fraction of the whole residuary variation, and can hardly form more than a thousandth part of the entire text.

The immense amount of work expended since then on comparison and collation has qualified this statement without shaking it." (See L. DE GRANDMAISON: *Jésus Christ*, I Vol., p. 38.)

Comparing this statement with the date and nature of other existing MSS. of classical literature either in East or West, real scholars like those of the Indian Research Institute (D. R. Bhandarkar) will be able to esteem at its full value the *unique* historical certitude attached to the writings of the New Testament. We must conclude that either all historical certitude is a myth or that the credentials of the New Testament are absolutely trustworthy.

THE CHRIST OF HISTORY

We have seen how a man came down to the frozen fields of our nothingness, sinfulness and utter helplessness in order to offer us his hand and lead us to the Father. Who is that man? It is cowardice to shirk this question so brimful with hope or tragedy for human-kind and for each one of us. Who is that man?

The kernel of the primitive Christian message gives us the answer. He is the Christ, the God-Man.

"The Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us", says St. John. True it is that Jesus from the outset did not appropriate to Himself the all-holy name of Jahwe: If He had done so, His countrymen, who had been nurtured in a strict belief of God's uniqueness and incomparable majesty, would have stoned Him for blasphemy before He had properly begun his ministry. Besides, the Jews of His time were not prepared to receive Him, and that is why He warned His disciples not to throw holy things before the gamblers with life who would trample on them. But as we shall see, His consciousness of His being Jahwe admitted of no growth; it was clear from the outset. The Christian Gospel has nothing to tell us about the transformation of a man or a hero into a god; its message is the descent of the Godhead to the state of bondage of the purely human.

An unprejudiced and conscientious examination of the historical documents of the New Testament makes it clear beyond doubt that there is no such thing in history as a Jesus who was only man. Such a figure is a pure fiction, a literary fancy of *littérateurs* and novel-writers such as Renan or Emil Ludwig.

The real men who actually heard Jesus delivering His message, who laboured, suffered, died for Him or who hated and dreaded Him, those men have a different tale to tell, and the Christ they knew was no other but the God-made-man who rose again on the third day.

It was the perfect conviction that Jesus Christ was God that made the evangelists describe His life only in the light of the divinity which they took for granted. What they wished to stress was that Christ was also man.

They described the life of the Master in a simple and artless way with no subsidiary intention of transfiguring it, precisely because the glory of the Resurrection was thrown into more luminous relief against the background of the poor and lowly life of Jesus.

The risen Christ, the God-man, has been the great reality of history, the turning-point of a new era. It

is for His sake that tears and blood have been shed. From the very beginning no other Christ but this has lived in the hearts of the faithful ; He alone is the Christ of History. Men knew only the Christ of the Resurrection and miracles. Any other Christ is in the words of Albert Schweitzer " a figure, projected by Rationalism, made animate by Liberalism and clothed in historical garments by modern Theology ".

Strict logic forces us to the following dilemma :

Either to reject the whole of Christ including His very existence — which no scholar is ready to do.

Or to believe the historical documents which picture for us on every page a Christ who claimed to be and proved Himself to be God Incarnate.

FIRST ACQUAINTANCE WITH JESUS

Exterior appearance extremely attractive and even fascinating ; in his eyes a burning, wakening, reproving look : the look of a Leader. According to the unanimous witness of the Gospel (from which in this sketch we draw as from purely historical documents) Jesus must have been a thoroughly healthy man, inured to fatigue and with a great capacity for work. He was vigorous and energetic : nowhere any sign of sickness or nervous strain. All the sufferings which came upon Him were due to His calling, to the privations and sacrifices which His mission laid upon Him. His joy in nature breathes the same fresh healthy outlook : He loved flowers and birds ; the hills and the lake were especially dear to Him. He spent a life more homeless and poor than the birds in their nests and the foxes in their holes. He Himself had not where to lay His head.

The evangelists bear unequivocal testimony to His intellectual genius. What struck them most (and what

strikes us still) in His human nature, was the tremendous clarity of His thought, the sure consciousness He had of His aim, and the resultant inflexibility and finality of His will. All His powers and His indomitable will are concentrated on one great heavenly idea. Neither human considerations nor Satanic suggestions will ever make Him deviate a hair's breadth from His determination to do God's will even at the cost of His own life. The great feature He requires in His disciples is determination. "No man putting his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God" (LUKE ix, 62).

Jesus was the man of clear will whose every action revealed the fixity of His purpose. In the whole of His public ministry not one single instant can be found when He had to reflect on an answer or when He hesitated in indecision or when He reversed a statement or went back on an action, and He demands the same fixity of purpose from His disciples. His whole life and being are a Yea or Nay, nothing else. Hence He alone can venture the imperative "Let your speech be Yea, Yea; Nay, Nay". "No man can serve two masters."

A man of absolute sincerity: His very enemies, the Scribes and Pharisees, bear witness to this (MARK xii, 14): with a hatred for compromise and for surface religiosity.

The concentration of the will on a fixed goal, this initiative, and focussed energy make of Jesus a born leader: a man who had only to meet men by the wayside to make them leave everything and follow Him as disciples.

There was something majestic in His attitude which was constantly felt by both disciples and crowds. Together with a feeling of attraction towards Him, they had constantly the strong impression of awe and reverence in His presence; His words and actions struck them with wonder.

He was not like other men. He was not like their own leaders — the Scribes and Pharisees; He was a man with an authority all His own. He did not say: It is

written in the Scriptures ; He said : I say to you. And the people applied to Him the greatest names of their prophets to express something of the towering ascendancy of the Master.

Jesus Himself was deeply conscious of the distance between Himself and men to whom His goodness felt attracted. He was a man apart, and again and again He withdraws to some lonely spot or to some silent hill to concentrate His forces in silence, alone with His Father. He loved solitude.

One aspect of Jesus which our soft modern caricaturists are apt to forget is that in Jesus there dwelt not only mighty powers held in restraint, and a disciplined will, but also the fire of holy zeal which could wax wrathful and show His displeasure in waves of passionate and vehement language : a number of His parables give expression to a heart moved with strong emotion. When Peter, His beloved disciple, wishes to break down His will to pursue the road which led to the Cross, or when He speaks about the rich who neglect to do good to their suffering brethren, He can be deeply moved and passionate in His language, and when He attacks the hypocrisy of the Scribes and Pharisees, His language is altogether feverish with flaming indignation :

“ Whited sepulchres ” He calls them.

“ Woe to you hypocrites ; because you make clean the outside of the cup and of the dish, but within you are full of rapine and uncleanness.” Here we can only picture Jesus with flaming eyes and glowing cheeks.

And to His words He joins at times symbolically prophetic actions in which He shows Himself to be the “ One sent by God ”, “ the Judge to be ” : such were the expulsion of the merchants from the temple or the withering curse He called down upon the fig-tree, which was a prophetic symbol of the approaching sinister curse on Israel, that fig-tree which the Lord had planted and which had remained unfruitful in good season as well as in bad.

Rising from a wounded love of truth His displeasure would find relief in stern severe words, as when He

did not hesitate to call His own ruler, the sensual king Herod, "that fox".

Jesus was not one to treat languidly; He was no timid weakling when the need arose to bear witness to the truth. His was a fighter's nature. But here too, in the midst of the fight, He always remained Himself; He never lost control. His anger is always the expression of supreme moral freedom, the act of one who could say truly: "For this came I into the world; that I should give testimony to the truth" (JOHN xviii, 37). And we feel in His words the vibration of the energetic resolve of a man who is ready to seal His words with His blood.

What strikes the eyes of the psychologist is the purposeful virility, absolute genuineness and austere uprightness of an heroic personality. People felt that the spirit of Jesus was heroism incarnate. It is this heroism in the unconditional staking of His life for the known truth which, psychologically speaking, led directly to Calvary. This iron Yea or Nay of His nature finds expression in those sayings which carry with them the breath of genuine originality: "If thine eye scandalize thee, pluck it out"; "He that shall lose his life for my sake, shall save it"; "You cannot serve God and Mammon." Many of these sayings have passed into world literature.

Have we then to classify Jesus among the thorough-going radical types of humanity? Or is He one of those dreamers living in a world of His own far removed from reality? As we go deeper into the depths of that soul, we realize more and more that we cannot compare Jesus to any single figure or to any group of figures in history. He can be explained only by Himself. Dr. L. W. Grensted, Professor of Philosophy at Oxford, had realized something of this fact when he wrote: "Since Jesus Christ refuses an interpretation in terms of the ordinary forces, laws and standards of the world, we must needs seek an interpretation of those forces, laws and standards in terms of Jesus Christ."

We may ask ourselves, for instance, whether this man, of such high principles, possessed of such a grand idea, had in him the sense of reality.

The answer is that He had that sense in an extraordinary degree : nothing dreamy, nothing like juggling, nothing ecstatic, nothing of a prophet lost in somnambulism. True, He saw visions ; why wonder ? Once He saw the heavens open and heard a voice saying : " Thou art my beloved Son ; in thee I am well pleased." On Mount Olivet, His Father transfigured Him, and common-sense workmen of seas and fields, the disciples, saw His garments white like snow and His face shining like a sun. Yet even on such occasions, Jesus gives the impression of a man perfectly calm and balanced, whose will remains centred on the great ideal of his life.

The singular occurrences in the Gospel narratives, such as instantly curing the sick, the lame, the crippled, the blind, the dumb, raising the dead, calming the storm, etc., do not appear in any way fortuitous exterior events, like odd bits of plaster on a finished image ; on the contrary, these occurrences, whatever you may call them, have their organic connection with the whole of Christ's historic appearance. They form part of, and are organically bound up with, the marvellous and supernatural course of His life. You cannot separate the historic Christ from the Christ of miracles. Besides, once we know who Christ is, we are not astonished any more at His works.

In this connection I wish to impress on any logical mind that the extraordinary in a phenomenon is in no way a justification for refusing it *a priori* objective reality. Such a process would be far from scientific. The reality of everyday experience is not the whole of reality. We do not say that anything has to be believed as soon as it is called " miracle ". Here, as in other historic facts, a rigid critical test is evidently necessary. But to refuse *a priori* to accept the possibility of a miracle is equal to enclosing the immense reality of things within the narrow limits of the human brain. If there exists a free God at all, He cannot be bound necessarily by the laws of nature which are every moment dependent upon Him and which are themselves but the will

of God expressed in matter. Only those logically deny the possibility of miracles who have subscribed to the formula "No true God ; therefore, no true miracles". *The Song of Bernadette*, the famous film on Lourdes, begins with the words: "For those who do believe no explanation is necessary. For those who do not believe no explanation is possible."

Let us now answer the question whether Jesus, soaring so high above the earth in all His aspirations, had the sense of reality.

He is intuitive and artistic in His outlook when He comprehends reality as a whole with its ultimate and profoundest meaning ; but He is soberly logical and severely rational when He is engaged on the determination or safeguarding of individual truths. He casts His reasoning, when need be, in the framework of rabbinical demonstration. Often His opponents try to catch Him in arguments ; but they have always to retire discomfited since they can find no reply to the deductions contained in their own premisses which His understanding and penetrating vision enable Him to expose.

It is with a ruthless hand that Jesus strips off the veneer laid on holy things by human hands, in order to clear the view into the very heart of holiness and morality. "You have heard that it was said to them of old : Thou shalt not commit adultery. But I say to you that whosoever shall look on a woman to lust after her, hath already committed adultery with her in his heart." "Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites ; because you tithe mint, and anise and cummin, and have left the weightier things of the law ; judgment, and mercy and faith" (MATTHEW xxiii, 23).

The eye for the substance and core of things presupposes in Jesus the gift of acute observation, an unusual faculty for clear seeing, even into the minutest details of life. However high His mind and heart soared above this world, He was attentive to every smallest detail in life, and it would not be difficult to draw a picture of the Jews of His time simply from details gathered from His parables and other sayings.

But in order to understand Jesus truly, it is essential to consider His relations with men. They are contained in three words: He loved them. But here also appears once more His sense of reality. He did not love an idealized unreal man; He professed no fanatical cult for humanity in the abstract; Jesus dealt with real men; He suffered from them; His love bears secret wounds. Yet He loved man, and has always continued to love him; Jesus has loved man as he is: with his weakness and misery and with all his powers for good or for evil.

When the soldiers spat upon Him and buffeted Him and set a crown of thorns on His head, He was silent; He did not judge even though they tormented or abused Him. This was the strength of the Man who sacrificed His less noble feelings towards men for the sake of the heights to which humanity may aspire. Can you imagine anything more sublime, more objective, more heroic than that moment of His Passion, when, hanging on the Cross of agony, He breathed the prayer: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do" (LUKE xxiii, 34)?

When Judas, a beloved apostle, pressed his traitor's lips on the holy face of the Master and kissed Him in order to signal to the soldiers awaiting in the darkness, Jesus felt the kiss like a hideous sore burn on His cheek, and yet He called Judas His friend.

His love for men is a real sympathy in the original meaning of the word, a sharing of the sufferings of men, no mere humanitarian or philanthropic theory but a living, and more, a suffering and dying, with men. It is the least among men, the disinherited, those whose life has suffered shipwreck, whom He calls in a special way His "brethren". So intimately did He identify their lot with Himself, that whatever was done to one of the least of His brethren was done to Him. So intensely did He wish to identify Himself with men that at the Last Supper He took bread and wine and uttered those words of mysterious power: "Take and eat. This is My Body... Drink ye all of this... This is My

Blood." Before uttering those words He had felt the need of kneeling down like a slave before each one of His disciples and of washing their feet.

It was His spirit of pure self-forgetful love which drove Him, that great lonely Figure, the Man of heroic independence, from the sunlit heights of His own luminous thoughts and aims into the drab and dingy workaday life of mankind. Again and again the evangelists tell us that He had compassion on the multitude, and that He went about doing good. He could not help healing the sick or watching over them with the kindness of a mother. At the risk of horriying the pious and the self-righteous, He associated with sinners. The adulterous woman, the brigand, have not repelled Him, and He, the holy Jesus, has wished to immortalize His love for them in that magnificent parable of the prodigal son.

He loved children. He, the great Messenger of God, all absorbed in His superhuman task of founding the Kingdom of God, took a little child in His arms ; He kissed and blessed it.

He loved His people and His country ; He wept at the sight of Jerusalem doomed to ruin.

He loved both rich and poor : He was no social reformer in the modern sense of the word. He did not wish to revolutionize society from without ; He was much too objective, much too closely in touch with realities to expect salvation from empty ideologies, packed with ever new regulations and dispositions. His aim was to operate a revolution of ideas and morals, and thus He knew that indirectly He would affect even the exterior structures, not from without but from within, at least in as far as His followers would live up to His doctrine and spirit.

He does not object to riches as such ; but He sees wealth as often making very difficult the approach to the Kingdom of God.- In the majority of Pharisees and Sadducees, those typical representatives of the property-owning, ruling class of His country, Jesus met with the devastating consequences of Mammon in a terrible form. They wanted to serve two masters :

God and Mammon. They became or rather allowed themselves to become deaf to Truth and blind to the Light.

He had friends among both rich and poor, but the poor He loved in a special way, not only because, on the whole, they were more detached and therefore spiritually more receptive of the Gospel; His preference is something innate in Him, a fundamental sentiment welling up out of that strong impulse of sympathy with suffering which cannot bear to have plenty when others are going hungry, or to rejoice while others mourn. That is why He did not want to have a home not even a stone whereon to lay His head. How far this is from people who sympathize with the poor, only in so far as they share the same ideas!

The heart of Jesus belongs to mankind; to every man; to the whole man; to his sorrows and — let us not forget it — to his joys also. No man has loved men as did the man Jesus.

A last feature in Jesus which should not be forgotten is the creative touch of a great poet, so tender and fresh, that no counterpart will be found in any other heroic or strictly ascetical nature.

WHO IS THIS MAN?

Does not His human nature seem to tend in opposite directions, upward to heaven, downward to man and to this world? Is His spirituality bi-polar, oscillating, not about one, but about two foci? Where is the point of unity in Him? If they are perfections, we must be able to harmonize them into a whole.

From the point we have reached so far in our inquiry, it is quite impossible to determine where these two sets of lines meet and integrate one living unity.

No man has ever spoken as that man, and yet none has ever been more heroic in deep silence when one word could have saved Him.

He is Master and King, yet He washes the feet of His disciples.

He is at the same time the "Lamb of God" and the "Lion of Juda".

Man of stern determination when He stood before the Roman Governor Pilate, yet loving with infinite tenderness and sweetness, like on earth only women do love, as when He stood before the tomb of His friend Lazarus or the bier of the widow of Naim's son.

Hallowed by long nights of prayer, He is wholly God's and can challenge without fear His very enemies with the words: "Who among you can convince me of sin?" Yet He gladly meets publicans and sinners.

He is dedicated to the vision of heavenly spaces; yet the tiniest things of the earth do not escape His eye.

His heart rejoices in the flowers of the field; yet His spirituality bears the stamp of the business man who calculates in terms of talents and responsibility.

He is a firebrand burning with prophetic wrath; yet He submits in silence to the foulest ignominies.

He is a unique ascetic Figure; yet He loves men as they have never been loved, and He dies for them.

Intransigent on any point of doctrine, as when He challenged His most intimate disciples either to admit the Eucharist or to depart; and on the other hand, excusing an adulteress and putting to shame her accusers with the simple words: "Let him, who is without sin, cast the first stone."

Hater of all religion, tradition and authority which is not founded on spirit and truth, yet esteeming so highly the value of rites, tradition and authority, that He introduced all these into His own Church.

To sum up, He surpasses all the summits of humanity in His serenity, His charity, His self-control, His purity, in His sublime doctrine, the splendour of His whole personality.

That was the impression He left, for example, on the two disciples who were joined by a stranger on their walk to Emmaus: "He has appeared amongst us, a powerful prophet in words and deeds." Words

which were never heard, deeds which were never done before.

And He kept up that moral and intellectual superiority with the greatest ease and simplicity for months and years till the moment He expired on Calvary.

Who is He?

From what point do those apparent contradictions arise and where do they meet that they may explain the harmony which was incarnate in the man Jesus?

In order to discover the answer we must ascend to the high summits of His soul : to the region of His inner life where He cries : " Abba, Father ! "

A GLANCE INTO HIS SOUL

At this stage of our inquiry into the character of Jesus, we are like the pilgrims of Palestine on their way to the temple of Jerusalem.

First they gazed from afar on the outer walls and porticos of the temple of God. Next they entered with reverence through the outer gates of the precincts called the " Holy " where the holocausts were burning and finally gazed on the place called " the Holy of Holies ", the heart of the temple and the centre of worship. We, too, stand before the living temple : Jesus. So far we have looked at Him only from without, and we have found Him incomprehensible. Now we must enter His soul and again ask the question : " Who is He ? "

What quickening forces and what religious conception dominated and animated Him?

The ultimate and profoundest motive force, the mainspring of His actions, was an unconditional surrender to His Father's will. Nothing is depicted with more impressive strokes in the Gospel than this mighty burning love of Jesus for His heavenly Father. In the whole of human history no man has so deeply absorbed and understood the words of the Old Testament :

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole strength" (DEUT. vi, 5).

The evangelists point out how Jesus lived and moved and was in the Father, and how constantly His intimate union with the Father overflowed in magnificent prayers which after centuries are still warm with the fervour of personal devotion and living experience. The God to whom He prays is not the silent god of Fate of contemporary Hellenism. His God is the all-creative, all-powerful, all-transcendent God, yet immanent in the world as we have described Him in our first chapter on Religion: It is the vision and experience of this all-operative, all-merciful, all-holy, absolutely free God which flashed forth in Jesus' teaching, transfigured His life, and which alone can explain His absolute devotion to the Will of God. He can truly say "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me" (JOHN iv, 34). No man has been devoted to God as this man.

On the other hand, the God to whom He prays, who is His world, His Reality, His life, belongs to Him in a special way. When He prays, He steps right out of the circle of humanity in order to be exclusively with the Father in that solitude of the Son with the Father which He loved so much. "I am not alone" (JOHN viii, 16, 29). He prays to the Father as no other man has prayed and He is always sure of being heard.

His intimate life with the Father shines forth in His absolute Holiness. History tells us how the life of even the greatest men — Jeremias, Paul, Augustine, Buddha, Mohammed — cannot be told without mentioning vast spiritual defeats. The life of Jesus alone runs its course without such crises, without any spiritual surrenders. He alone among all men has no pardon to ask from God.

Who is this Jesus? His life is like a rare poem from a foreign land and yet is a living Reality. All that is narrated of Him is no external ornament, no sweet-

scented veil of beautiful phrases and maxims woven about Him. It is all graven into His concrete, workaday life.

Once upon a time there was actually a Man who knew Himself to be in the most intimate union of life and love with His Father in Heaven, who saw God's creative power at work as if with the naked eye and whose appearance on the scene of history was an apparition of sanctity. What is that man in the innermost sanctuary of His soul?

None can answer this question with certainty save one: Jesus Himself. No mind is clearer, no heart purer, no speech is truer than His; none has loved the Father more and none was more beloved of the Father: "This is my well-beloved son in whom I am well pleased. Hear ye Him."

THE SON OF MAN

"Lord Jesus what hast Thou to tell us of Thyself?"

What strikes us in the self-revelation of Jesus is the splendour of its veracity, simplicity and directness. Nothing violent or unnatural or noisy, as was the case, for example, with the miracle-men, kings and princes of the Hellenistic period. Everyone of His words welled up from His heart like a lotus from the deep. He is full of the mysteries of God. But we see that these mysteries do not surprise Him. He speaks of them naturally, as one born in them.

Jesus came to establish the Kingdom of God, foretold by the prophets, expected by the holy men of Israel. He will explain gradually in what this Kingdom of God consists.

In order to prepare men's wills for the coming of this Kingdom, His message runs: "Repent and believe the Gospel." For God can only work where

His holy will sways the conscience of men. Earnestly as Jesus emphasizes the moral teaching of repentance and justice, nevertheless, these are not the final or the sublimest words He has to say to mankind. Repentance and Justice are to Jesus not the Kingdom itself but the way to it.

The Kingdom itself is given freely by God alone. It has been prepared by God from the beginning of the world. It will be "everlasting life". Now it is through Jesus that this Kingdom of "everlasting life" has a beginning in time :

"Now this is eternal life : That they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent" (JOHN xvii, 3).

Jesus is deeply conscious that the Kingdom of God is not something outside of Him. He is fully conscious that He, in His own Person, is the Centre of the Kingdom,— that He *is* the Kingdom. Numerous texts might be quoted to show this.

He knows that in His person, here and now, are spanned the hereafter and the present ; the end of time and the generation in which He is living ; the past as far back as the beginning of the world. He knows Himself to be the One who hereafter, surrounded by all His angels, shall sit upon the throne of His majesty and gather together all nations before Him and separate the sheep from the goats, and shall " set the sheep on His right and the goats on His left ". Here and now He knows Himself to be the Lord of the New Kingdom who shall say to those on His right hand : " Come, ye blessed of my Father, possess ye the kingdom prepared from the beginning of the world."

It is a bold and, in a human mouth, a tremendous thing which Jesus here says of Himself. We no longer see Jesus among the flowers and the children, among the sick and the sinners ; but we see Him on the judgment-seat of God. He is no longer only the sublime teacher, the glowing prophet, but the Lord of the approaching end of all time, our Judgment, the Fate of the world.

This consciousness Jesus often expressed in close relation to a term by which He designated Himself. A term which strikes us to-day as very singular. He called Himself "the Son of Man". What does He mean by that?

Far back in history, the noblest souls of Israel inspired by God had announced the coming on this earth from heaven of a Kingdom of which the "Son of Man" would be the Lord and Judge at the end of time. Throughout the long series of histories, psalms and descriptions of the Bible, there runs this ray of light announcing the Messiah. Now from the beginning of His mission, Jesus knows with unparalleled assurance that this prophecy is fulfilled in His person. He knows that He is "set for the fall, and for the resurrection of many" (LUKE ii, 34).

He claims that our attitude towards His person is decisive for all eternity. He says: "Every one therefore that shall confess me before men, I will also confess him before my Father who is in heaven. But he that shall deny me before men, I will also deny him before my Father who is in heaven" (MATT. x, 32, 33). "Blessed shall you be when men shall hate you for the Son of man's sake." (LUKE vi, 22).

It is evident that, since Jesus refers Daniel's prophecy of the Son of Man to Himself, His consciousness transcends all bounds of human possibilities and His claims reach up to the clouds of heaven to the right hand of God Himself. But note that they reach further still. Jesus' conception of the Son of Man is by no means limited to the prophet's vision. He is not only the judge of the end of time. He is already in the present the source of salvation (MATT. ii, 28; LUKE x, 23).

He calls Himself the Master of Religion. "The Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath" (MARK ii, 28). The "Son of Man" does what God alone does, what Jewish scribes did not even concede to the expected Messiah — He forgives sins:

"That you may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (he saith to the man

sick of the palsy), I say to thee: Arise, take up thy bed, and go into thy house" (MARK. ii, 10, 11).

In the forgiving of sins the actual redeemership of the Son of Man reaches its apex, and His messianic claims their strongest and most emphatic expression. Here Jesus attains not only to the right hand of God but into His very heart.

The prophets had prophesied great suffering and humiliation in the Messiah to come, and *from the very beginning*, Jesus is conscious that it is the will of His Father that this redeemership should be consummated in suffering and through the Cross. Jesus knows Himself to be a man among men, yea the slave of men. Yet, at the same time, He knows himself to be the King, the Judge, the Saviour of the whole of mankind. Now, this notion was novel, unheard of in the whole history of Israel. This was the determining cause of Golgotha; had Jesus claimed to be the Messiah in the petty nationalistic sense of the Jews of the time, He would not have been crucified, even though His claim had been disputed and disallowed. For according to Jewish law, such a claim, though baseless, was not blasphemy against God and therefore was not a capital offence. It was only when Jesus in that grave hour not merely gave assent to the high-priest's question: "Art thou the Christ, the Son of God?", but with that serene truth which was His essence added the further confession: "And you shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of the power of God and coming on the clouds of heaven"—it was only then that He gave the unequivocal answer, which made the high-priest rend his garments, with the words: "He has *blasphemed*, what further need have we of witnesses? Behold, now you have heard the *blasphemy*: What think you? But they answering said: He is guilty of death. Then did they spit in his face and buffeted him" (MATT. xxvi, 63-67).

Jesus died because He claimed to be the unique Son of Man and Son of God.

From the first moment of His public ministry *He*

knew with a certainty that admitted of no growth, that His mission of world-judge in the future and of Redeemer in the present were involved in His very nature. The consciousness of this fact admitted of no growth. Numerous and convincing texts might be quoted to prove that from the very first Jesus was absolutely certain about this. See, for instance, MARK i, 14-iv, 34.

Hence, it will not do to assent only to a Jesus of noble and pure humanity, or to a Jesus of sinlessness, truth and graciousness, if we eliminate from His teaching His claims to Divinity. It is an historical fact that the substance of His teaching is grounded on the message that the Kingdom of God with all its powers is present in His person — that with Him eternity enters into time, and that “the acceptable year of the Lord” is now come.

All the so-called “liberal” schools have succeeded in producing only an incomplete and fragmentary Christ. But such a Christ never existed. No wonder that the succeeding liberal schools brutally shattered to pieces the pictures of the fancy Christ drawn by their predecessors.

Now let us put the question: “When Jesus called Himself the Son of Man, the Judge, the King of the last day, the Redeemer, the Saviour of the present, on what was that consciousness grounded?” Before answering, a remark is necessary: We must remember that Jesus was a member of the Jewish race which was strictly monotheistic in its thought, and Jesus Himself bears constant witness to this One personal God of heaven and earth, absolutely transcendent and distinct from the world and from man. Therefore this question can never be answered in a polytheistic or pantheistic sense. This setting of the problem has to be borne in mind when we answer the question of the relation of Jesus’ nature to God.

What is Jesus at the summit of His being? a separate man or one with God?

What do His works tell us?

What does He Himself say on this point?

THE SON OF GOD

The first thing that strikes us when we study Jesus in His historical setting is this conscious assurance that He is exalted above all angels, kings and prophets. With boundless authority He sets His work higher; not only relatively but absolutely. There is nothing great or holy in the Old Covenant, not even the temple, not even the sabbath day, indeed not even its Law, which is not subject to His will and authority. Speaking about Himself He says: "I tell you that here is one greater than the temple." "Blessed are the eyes that see the things which you see. For I say to you, that many prophets and kings have desired to see the things that you see, and have not seen them" (LUKE x, 23 ff.). God, His Father, instituted the sabbath day, yet "the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath" (MARK ii, 28). The all-holy God, His Father, had given the Law through Moses; but here is One who corrects the precepts of Moses no less than six times. In doing so He does not, like the prophets of old, appeal to a divine commission from Jahwe; He speaks on His own authority, out of His own knowledge, of His own right: "But I say to you..." (MATT. xx, 22 ff.).

The same impression of essential oneness with God is evoked by the miracles of Jesus. However much these wonders may be disputed by *a priori* criticism, no one can deny that not only on His disciples but also on His bitterest antagonists, His mighty works made the strongest impression. What distinguishes His miracles from those of the prophets of Israel, such as Elias, Eliseus, etc., is the regal self-assurance with which He worked them. He does not need to appeal to the Almighty God. His miracles proceed not from the Father but from Himself. "I will.....Be thou made clean" (MARK i, 41); "Ephpheta, be thou opened" (MARK vii, 34); "Damsel, I say to thee, arise" (MARK v, 41); "Arise, take up thy bed, and go into thy house" (MARK ii, 11). Here is not a commission but omni-

potence, which has its root in an " ego " one with God.

The way Jesus interprets the prophetic messianic passages of the Old Testament throws further light on His consciousness of oneness with the All-Holy God. Wherever the prophets see God at work, Christ with absolute self-confidence, places His own " ego " in the place of God. He is Himself that " Lord of Hosts " (MATT. xi, 10 ; LUKE vii, 27 ff.) for whom, according to Malachy, a personal forerunner shall prepare the way. He Himself is the wonder-working Jahwe (MATT. xi, 5) whose acts are foretold by Isaias. He Himself is the good Shepherd whom Isaias and Ezechiel call Jahwe. To Himself He applies what was written of the Lord, that out of the mouths of infants and sucklings should proceed power to aid Him against His adversaries. Jahwe is described as the husband of Israel and He, too, calls Himself the bridegroom of all His followers. He is conscious that Jahwe and His own ego are one and the same.

As we saw in the healing of the man sick of palsy (MARK ii, 10), Jesus gives unequivocal expression to the fact that He knows Himself to be Jahwe Himself manifested, and that His power to redeem and forgive sins rests on His oneness with Jahwe.

This throws a new light on His intellectual, moral and religious character, and we can for the first time get at the root explanation of the character of Jesus. This root is none other than the oneness of Jesus with the Father.

This oneness explains whence His human will derives that bold independence and certainty with which He determines His goal ; it explains that consistency and finality in all His actions and that perfect oneness with the holy and divine Will.

Only Oneness with God, the substantial Holiness, can explain this absolutely pure and holy humanity of Christ. In the holiness of Jesus there is nothing attained by long struggle ; it all seems to be an innate endowment so that imperfection and sin are foreign, not only to His acts, but also to His very being.

Only the Godhead of Jesus is the last explanation of the miracle of His most sacred humanity. Only on that assumption is it psychologically intelligible that His teaching should embrace both the present and the future till the end of time ; that eternity and time should meet in His consciousness : " Before Abraham was, I am " ; that He should know Himself to be at once the Saviour and Judge of the world — that the Kingdom of God should be His Kingdom : Himself.

Only the oneness with Jahwe explains the insistence and exclusiveness with which He makes His own person the central point of Religion. He is the living Truth, the living Justice, the Object of Worship and of Faith, the Source of supernatural Life, the living Water. The Kingdom of God is inseparable from His own person ; for in Him is it manifest. Nowhere in the history of religions do we find anything like this. Whenever in history a religious cult has been founded, the founder was not its object but merely the instrument of its foundation. It was not the person Buddha or Mohammed or Moses that was the real substance of the new belief or cult, but rather what each one of them taught. Not so in Christianity, for Christianity is Jesus, and the Christian teaching is that Jesus is the Christ. " Whom do you say that I am ? " was the decisive question put by Jesus on the threshold of the new Kingdom. Hence, from the beginning His person alone is the living centre of the new community, the source of all its fruitfulness. And in " His last hour ", at supper, He did not give a book to His disciples, but He gave Himself, " flesh and blood ", as a perpetual commemoration of Himself. " Take ye and eat : This is my body...Drink ye all of this for this is my blood of the new testament which shall be shed for many."

There was from the beginning nothing which Jesus demanded more urgently of His disciples than unconditional attachment to His person, an imitation of Him which should have no limit but extend even to the bearing of His Cross. " He that taketh not up

his cross and followeth me, is not worthy of me" (MATT. x, 38).

What He demands of His followers for His Father in heaven, that He demands also for Himself, namely an unflinching faith in Him and a boundless love for Him.

"You believe in God, believe also in me." When Jesus lays it down that "the greatest and first commandment" is to love God with our whole heart and our whole soul, there follows in the same spirit and with the same emphasis His new demand: "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me." He wants to be loved not only by all men but also above everything else, even above what is sweetest and dearest to the human heart: our parents, our children, our brothers and sisters.

When has a mere man laid or dared to lay all humanity under the obligation of such utter devotion to his person? There breaks through, at this staggering claim of Jesus, a consciousness which transcends all created standards. Jesus is not merely *with* God: He is God Himself. We may inwardly revolt against this fact, we may protest against it, but we can never banish it from the world.

The ministry of Jesus, His teaching, His actions are the works of a Man who knows Himself to be, at the root of His being, substantially united to God. This it is which shone out of His eyes, which gave His whole human appearance the lustre of the supernatural, which made the man with the unclean spirit cry out: "Thou art the Holy One of God."

A last question: "How does Jesus regard and express this substantial union of His person with God?" We know He calls the relation a relation of Father and Son. In the light of what has been said it is historically evident that Jesus understands His Sonship in a transcendent way. The relationship of His Sonship towards the Father stands out in towering height above all our human notions of fatherhood and sonship (Cf. KARL ADAM). Jesus explains the

character of His Sonship after the seventy-two had returned from their preaching tour.

He had sent out seventy-two disciples to preach the gospel of the kingdom all over the country. They all returned rejoicing, with the news that evil spirits were subject to them. And Jesus tells them that they should rather rejoice because their names are written in heaven. And "in that same hour he (Jesus) rejoiced in the Holy Ghost, and said: I confess to thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hidden these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them to the little ones. Yea, Father, for so it hath seemed good in thy sight. All things are delivered to me by my Father and no one knoweth who the Son is but the Father; and who the Father is but the Son, and to whom the Son will reveal him. And turning to his disciples, he said: Blessed are the eyes that see the things which you see. For I say to you, that many prophets and kings have desired to see the things that you see, and have not seen them; and to hear the things that you hear, and have not heard them" (LUKE x, 21-24).

These, and similar passages, are words which span infinities upon infinities. The Son is a reality to which in its ultimate depth no one has access save only the Father, and conversely the reality of the Father is revealed to the Son alone.

Thus Father and Son stand in a wholly unique and exclusive communion, in which no one else has any part. If we strip this self-revelation of Jesus of its mystical covering, we find the kernel to be nothing but a clear, unequivocal attestation to the unique, essential relation of His person to the Father and of the Father to Him—the fundamental mystery of the life of the Holy Trinity in one unique living God.

In its deepest meaning the religion of Christ is summed up in the words: "Through the Son to the Father." There is no other way to the Father but the Son.

That is why, to the question of the apostle Thomas, "Lord, how can we know the way?", Jesus answered:

"I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life."

The riddle of the historical appearance of Christ has been solved in His own words: "No one knows the Father but the Son" (MATT. ii, 27); "I and the Father are one" (JOHN x, 30).

At these words human thought fails and the tongue goes dumb. Can we, may we, dare we, give credence to this man? Is it not our duty to conclude that this man was mistaken though He was the holiest who ever lived? Does not a reverential sense of God's uniqueness and majesty oblige us to refuse assent, to rend our garments with Caiphas and cry out "He hath blasphemed!"?

And yet in this question of questions not man, but God, has the last word. Is not God greater than man's conception of God? And suppose that God willed to prove Himself God and reveal the infinity of His love and the measurelessness of His love by assuming for our sake the nature of a creature and by becoming man and by dying on a Cross?

What if God demands precisely this belief in order to break our human pride and bring our mind into subjection to its Maker?

We cannot ignore Jesus. He is possibly God — and, given the possibility that God appeared upon earth, we can see clearly that the humanity of Jesus was the right, the true, the unique place for His theophany; for nowhere else do there appear all the attributes of God; His majesty, His omnipotence, His holiness and justice, His compassion and grace, so purely and so continuously and so simply as here.

If God appeared on earth in the form of a man, He can only have appeared in the person of Jesus. In the words of Jesus Himself: there is no other way besides Him.

Moreover, the final and decisive word on the question of Christ's divinity and unique redeemership was expressed by God Himself in the Resurrection of Christ from the dead: the final proof of Himself to which Christ appealed so often during His lifetime.

The fact that Christ rose from the dead is undeniably stated by six historical narratives, those of Mat-

thew, Mark, Luke and John ; a few but revealing references in the Acts of the Apostles (i, 3 ff. ; x, 41, etc.) ; and lastly St. Paul's famous account in his first Epistle to the Corinthians (xv, 3-8). For the detailed critical study of these facts I direct my readers to the book of Karl Adam already quoted : *The Son of God*, Chapter VII ; L. de Grandinasion's *Jesus Christ* and many other scholarly works. We shall see in the next chapter the importance of the fact that Christ rose again from the dead. If the Christ is actually so tremendously loved or hated, it is because He is alive. He stands, as it were, in the centre of the earth. The gaze of men's souls is centred on Him. At first the effect is only like an image on the retina of our bodily eyes. Some men look away and say : " It is a man only " ; others look again at Him with a pure eye, an unbiassed mind and especially with a heart athirst for Light.

Those men who dare to pray for Light recognize in Him the man-God, the God Incarnate. By Baptism and Communion that Christ, who at first was but an Image, becomes a living Reality in the soul. He implants in us the seed of eternal glory. In Baptism He gives our souls the pledge of incorruption. One day, if we are faithful, He will embrace us in divine transfiguration for all eternity " face to face ".

O ! WHO can heal me ?
Give me at once Thyself.
Send me no more
A messenger
Who cannot tell me what I wish.

ST. JOHN OF THE CROSS

Christianity

The Whole of Religion

WITH THE Vedanta we hold that the world has but one meaning, not many meanings. Now, what is the one deepest meaning of the world? The answer is : Jesus Christ.

We have seen before that Religion is the whole of man. In fact, the deepest law in man is a cry to God. Christianity is the full answer to that cry, and hence it subsumes in itself the whole of Religion. Christ is the external appeal corresponding to the deepest instinct in the human soul. That is why I can, may, and must trust Him unconditionally.

So far we have seen what Christ is in Himself. Now, we must inquire what He is to us. Let us first take stock of the conclusions reached so far :

Jesus Christ is the God-man. First of all, He was a man like us but a perfect man : *the* man. His human body and soul were no empty husk, no phantom of the divine, not an illusion. Real eyes, real hands and feet He had, and the heart that was pierced by a lance was a human heart with human blood. A real perfect man ! That alone was a revelation to us. In fact, without knowing that sweet human personality of goodness and mercy we should never have known all that a human heart can be. It is because He was so truly man, that even as man He remains the contemporary of all ages, who still reveals, both to the

intellectuals and the ignorant, the mystery of their own souls. But that man was not only man. Napoleon had but to fix his eagle glance on Jesus Christ to cry out : " I know something about men and I tell you that Jesus Christ was no mere man " (*BEAUTERNE : Sentiments de Napoléon sur le Christianisme*). That man claimed and proved Himself to be God and no one of His hearers, whether friend or foe, has ever laughed at the claim, and for twenty centuries millions of men and women have believed Him.

Such is Christ, a perfect synthesis of a perfect human and a divine nature. How human He is but how divinely human ! How divine but how humanly divine ! As it is natural for us to be at the same time spirit and matter in one human personality, so it is natural for Christ to be, at the same time, God and man but in one divine personality. So harmonious was the wedding of the divine and the human in Jesus Christ, that those who knew and loved Him as man were naturally led to adore Him as God. Yet, no mere mixture of the divine and the human, neither are there in Christ two persons in one. In Christ the divinity remains evidently what it is ; so does His humanity (a mixture would be a contradiction), but the human nature of Christ is assumed through God's power into the one person of the Divine Word. Any Catholic child will synthesize these data in the formula : " Christ is the union of two natures, the divine and the human, in the one person of the Logos (Word). "

At first sight it may seem to be a trifling matter to define so accurately the person of Christ. Some people, afraid of thinking, have called it hairsplitting. The fact is that, if it were possible to change one single term in this definition, it would be a catastrophe for humanity because it would frustrate the plan of God, viz. the union of God with man. If the body and blood of Christ is not a human body and human blood like ours, if His soul is not a human soul, then Christ has assumed a nature different from ours, and it is not we who through Christ can have

access to God. And if Christ is not truly God, He cannot unite us to God. Finally, if Christ is not one, viz. one person, then the bond which has to unite the humanity with God does not exist, and in that case Christ cannot be said to have become the mediator between God and our fallen race. As a general who occupies the only passage which unites two countries, so Christ has come to occupy the precise spot between humanity and God, where every man has to pass if he wishes to go to the Father (1 TIM. ii, 5). It is only through Christ, who is perfectly equal to God and perfectly equal to man, that mankind can emerge from the abyss of nothingness and sinful misery into the divine plane of absoluteness and glory. None other than Christ the God-man can redeem us. The formula which defines Christ necessarily defines Christianity also. Christ is everything in the religion of which He is the centre, and if He were not everything, Christianity would be nothing; but He is everything, and through Him, Christianity is everything.

HOW DID GOD REDEEM US?

St. Paul is never tired of answering this question. In his letter to Titus, he writes : . . " the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and might cleanse to himself a people acceptable, a pursuer of good works " (TIT. ii, 13, 14). Across the immense stretches of nothingness and sin which separated heaven from earth, God through Christ re-established the connection of the divine current. First, by so doing, God made possible our human co-operation with God; secondly, through His example and doctrine He has made the way easier, free to us, to connect the dark houses of our souls with the mighty power-house of Divine Light.

In order to understand Christianity it is of capital importance to bear in mind that redemption is primarily and essentially a gratuitous communication of God to men ; it is also, secondarily, a restoration of an order of harmony between God and man which had been spoiled by sin. God wants this redemption to be worked out with the maximum possible co-operation of man.

BETHLEHEM

We repeat the question : How did God work out the Redemption ?

By becoming one of us in Christ ; a man with the flesh and blood of a man ; with the soul of a man ; a man as we : with heart, intellect and will ; a man linked up in the great current of Adam's blood, and this man is God. By becoming man, He became the new ancestor of the human race who in opposition to Adam would transmit to his progeny not death but Life (ROM. v).

Through the mere fact of God becoming man in Bethlehem, our salvation is begun and already radically effected.

" Behold the lamb of God, behold him who taketh away the sin of the world " (JOHN i, 29). But Bethlehem stands not only for objective redemption ; it is also a lesson for our souls and for our hearts. We all wish intensely to be loved ; and the higher and nobler the person who loves us, the greater the happiness of our souls. Unhappily in this world we so rarely find lovers who prove their noble love with true not to say, heroic deeds. In Christ, we have a perfect Lover. Can you meditate on the fact that God has become a small child in the stable of Bethlehem and doubt still that God loves you ? Before

that concrete example of infinite Love and Humility, ask yourself: "What have I done for Christ? What am I doing for Christ? What ought I to do for Christ?"

CALVARY

"Who his own self bore our sins in his body upon the tree: that we, being dead to sins, should live to justice: by whose stripes you were healed" (1 PET. ii, 24).

JESUS REDEEMED US BY SUFFERING & DYING FOR US

We know very well that God cannot die. But it is not God, as such, who is dying; it is a man substantially united to the Word of God, a man who is God, God Incarnate. We have seen that humanity was no longer a pure and guiltless humanity. We had sinned as a race on account of our human solidarity with our first parent, Adam, and to the sin of our race we had added our innumerable personal sins. Now, sin, as we have seen, is the greatest disorder thinkable in a world created and sustained by God. To undo this painful disorder and above all to do away with the guilt of men, Christ became the responsible leader of guilty mankind. In a supreme act of moral freedom and spiritual heroism, He mounted the Cross not as a mere substitute for us, but as the Head of humanity and in solidarity with it. In a sense, we sinners hung with Him on the Cross.

TURN FOR TURN

Jesus, my King, I have crucified Thee,
Now it is my turn, Crucify me !
Make Thou the Cross, be it only like Thine,
Mix Thou the gall ; let Thy Love be the Wine —
Shrink not to strip me of all, save Thy Grace,
Stretch me out well, till I fit in Thy place,
These are my hands — felon's hands — and my feet,
Drive home the nails, my King, the pain will be sweet.
Raise me ! and take me not down till I die.
Only let Mary, my mercy, stand by.
And last — let the spear, while I live, do its part
Right through the heart, my King, right through the
heart.

— REV. C. P. HILL

Henceforth, we are redeemed of the unpardonable, hopeless guilt. True, we still bear traces of our former bondage : concupiscence, sickness, death. But all the sting and hopelessness has been taken away. These traces are no longer a brand of guilt but only scars of old wounds left in the redeemed, which by the will of the all-wise God call us to humility and penance. By removing the guilt of sin, God has guaranteed to the whole of the human race forgiveness, grace and mercy, provided we are and remain in union with Christ through Faith, Baptism and a pure life. All the possibility of forgiveness for the centuries to come was gained by Christ in excruciating torments on the Cross, when the hours were counted by the dropping of God's blood.

And suppose (which may God avert) that after your Baptism you allowed yourself to be fascinated by this world and led away far from your Father into the far-away country of selfishness and sin, always remember that you bear His mark. He will recognize in you the character of sonship. Though torn and bleeding from the thorns, He will be ready to press your bleeding soul to His Great Heart provided this time

you repent in earnest, and are decided to sin no more. Never despair! "The world never forgives: it is only God and our mothers that can do that"
— E. T. FOWLER.

Another reason for Christ's suffering is that He wished to give us an antidote against the passions of our lower nature, but a remedy so strong that, if we will, the onslaughts of our lower nature may henceforth become occasions of victory and means of showing our unshakable love for God. A spirit of selfishness and sensuality is seething about us and threatens constantly to inflame the blood of young men and women in selfish enjoyment. Christ on *the* Cross is the antidote against the body-and-soul killing poison of the age. But perhaps the deepest reason for the mystery of the Cross is the one given by St. Paul: "He loved me and delivered himself for me" (GAL. ii, 20). Christ could have redeemed and sanctified us without that cruel death on the Cross. The Incarnation alone was of infinite value. But who can restrain God's love? For our sakes, in order to show us in a concrete human way the greatness of His love (JOHN xv, 13), and the hideousness of sin (ST. THOMAS, *Summa Theol.* 3, 48. 2), Christ chose freely to suffer and die for us.

JESUS REDEEMED US THROUGH HIS EXAMPLE & HOLY DOCTRINE

"One is your master: Christ" (MATT. xxiii, 10).

We have seen that after the Fall, man was in some way blinded by the fascination and scandals of the world. Man had lost sight of his true end and of the path that leads to it. Then a Man rose up and spoke to the world; and His hearers were struck with wonder and said to themselves: "Never did a man

“speak as this man.” In fact, He was the “Light of the World” piercing through the clouds of error and doubt, the one “in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge” (COL. ii, 3). He came to liberate us from our ignorance, to which He would oppose the power of His own example and doctrine. He would give Himself to the world as the highest model of mankind. (See GAL. iii, 27; iv, 19; ROM. xiii, 13, 14; ROM. viii, 29; MATT. xix, 21.)

Never has the idea of eternal life been formulated so clearly, so simply, and so surely. The desperate efforts of groping for God have made way for perfect certitude, and doubts have given way to rest of soul in God, the Father. Whence have I come? Whither am I going? Why am I here? It is all as clear as daylight. I am not an accidental product of nature, and my soul is of such an immense value, that God became man in order to die for its salvation. Life is no longer a frightful experience, far away from God. In Christ, life becomes the straight road to heaven. Death? It is the door to our Father’s House. Would this simple doctrine not make of your life a bright and confident existence?

JESUS REDEEMED US THROUGH HIS RESURRECTION & ASCENSION

(1 PET. i, 3-5; 19-21. ACTS v. 13. 1 COR. xv, 12-29; vi, 14. 1 THESS. iv, 13-18. ROM. vi, 4; viii, 11. COL. iii, 1, 2.)

“I lay down my life that I may take it again. No man taketh it away from me: but I lay it down of myself, and I have power to lay it down; and I have power to take it up again” (JOHN x, 17 ff.).

In this and many other similar passages, Jesus had foretold His Death and Resurrection. And Jesus kept His word. He rose from the dead on the third day.

Later on, we shall see the grandeur that the Rising of Christ implies for us, members of the human race (2 COR. v, 15). The Resurrection and Ascension to Heaven were a necessary complement to the redeeming death of Jesus Christ. Actually, He lives more than any of us. His glorified and transfigured Being is a flaming centre in the heart of the divinity; His four wounds and pierced Heart, now transfigured in splendour, are, as it were, the luminous channels through which He transfuses divine Life into the souls who are united to Him (HEB. ii, 10; v, 9; JOHN vii, 39; xvi, 17).

In heaven Christ continues the great gesture of sacrifice which He made on the Cross. "He is the Lamb standing as it were slain" (APOC. v, 6). But now He offers no longer as the slave of men nailed to a Cross but as the triumphant and glorious King who constantly offers up His past suffering for the salvation of mankind. His transfiguration is the pledge of that transfiguration which awaits us, when our heart will throb deep and high in unison with the Heart that beats at the summit of all things and rings out the rhythm of universal delight.

And even at present the Risen Christ is a source of untold joy and hope for every true Christian, because through Him and in Him we know that good is stronger than evil.

We conclude that the Christian Religion is the perfect religion of man. Christ is the perfect answer to the deepest call of man's soul. Let our worship centre round this Divine Person; let it pass through Him and nothing will be able to resist us; and in order to pass through Christ, our human way of worship need not be mutilated. Christ has assumed the whole of our human nature; hence there is nothing really human that cannot be integrated in His religion.

JESUS REDEEMED US BY GIVING US HIS MOTHER

Calvary is neither historical nor complete without Mary. Mary stood under the Cross, and John, the Virgin Apostle, was there as our representative. Such is the belief of one of the oldest Catholic Traditions.

And Jesus spoke from the Cross :

“ Behold thy Mother ” ; and to Mary He said :
“ Woman, behold thy son . ”

Since then generations of men have taken her as their Mother.

Mary, the mother of Jesus is the perfect woman of humanity, the glory of womanhood. She, as St. Ignatius says, was ‘ created to praise God ’, and how magnificently she did it.

Mary ! whose virgin bosom was uncrost
With the least shade of thought to sin allied ;
Woman ! above all women glorified,
Our tainted nature’s solitary boast ;
Purer than foam on central ocean tost ;
Brighter than eastern skies at daybreak strewn
With fancies roses, than the unblemished moon
Before her wane begins on heaven’s blue coast ;
Thy image falls to earth. Yet some I ween,
Not unforgiven the suppliant knee might bend
As to a visible Power, in which did blend
All that was mixed and reconciled in Thee
Of mother’s love with maiden purity,
Of high with low, celestial with terrene !

So wrote Wordsworth, non-Catholic as he was. It was his hymn of praise to Our Lady, and may he be in high heaven, for even St. Bernard never wrote anything more true and beautiful. No woman has been loved and cherished as the Madonna Mary.

Her story goes back to the morning of creation, when the woman Eve had been made by God the loveliest creature, beautiful not only with the light of the

soul but chiefly with the radiance of God's grace. In the story of the Fall I have told the tale of our sorrow and degradation, together with the promise of God to re-create, in a sense, mankind on a divine plan of grace. Mary was that creature, chosen and announced by God from the beginning of the world, who would become the mother of the God-made-man. Predestined for this high calling she was conceived immaculate without the stain of original sin, and she was lovely with the radiated beauty of God who would come and dwell in her. For Mary it was, who would adapt the unchanging and eternal wisdom of God to the understanding of man. The Word, the eternal Wisdom, before Mary presented it to us garbed in mortal flesh, was well-nigh unintelligible to men. For man is a creature of senses and understands well only what he can touch. The Word, on the other hand, before Mary revealed it unto us clothed in her flesh, was purely God, "whom no man hath seen at any time" (JOHN i, 18). But through Mary, the eternal Wisdom became intelligible to man. Man could understand it now because through her it was expressed in visible form.

No man would have any part in this. The spirit of God would overshadow her and the Word of God would take flesh in the womb of the Virgin Mary. It is from Mary that the Word would draw the flesh and the blood that went to constitute His manhood. Proximately and intimately, as to His human nature, Jesus was the real son of Mary. Mary became truly the mother of God, '*Theotokos*', as the Greeks called her.

Have we not here a supreme affirmation of woman's personality and independent destiny? "The world is governed by its ideal", writes Lecky, "and seldom or never has there been one which has exercised a more profound or, on the whole, a more salutary influence than the medieval conception of the Virgin Mary."

In Mary, too, the healthiest and greatest ideals of India are concentrated: perfect virginity, perfect motherhood.

The Irish patriot, Padraic Pearse, when condemned to death, sent a last poem to his own mother in the form of a prayer that she might read and pray it after his execution. I quote it because it so beautifully illustrates what Mary, our mother, means to us, Catholics.

"Dear Mary, thou who sawest thy firstborn son, go forth to die amidst the scorn of men, receive my firstborn son into thy arms who also goeth forth to die for men ; and keep him by thee till I come to him.

Dear Mary, I have shared thy sorrow and soon shall share thy joy."

OUR HUMAN WAY OF THINKING IS THE ONE REQUIRED FOR CHRISTIANITY

Not because it is our way of thinking but because God has chosen that way in Christ. Without Christ, our human way of thinking about God would always have remained infinitely insufficient. We have seen and experience corroborates it — that the human mind has an innate tendency to anthropomorphize its highest concepts so that it requires a constant effort not to anthropomorphize God Himself. The Greeks and Romans, as well as the Hindus, have tried to find God upon earth as a man, for they felt that the law of love required the presence of the beloved. The Maratha poet Tukaram, one of the greatest leaders of the Vaishnavite cult after Ramanuja, Tulsi Das and Namdev, well illustrate the craving of the human heart after a personal and human God : "The worship of the impersonal laid no hold on my heart" (*Râmâyana*, Book vii, Doha 107). And do we not find tombs and stones being worshipped even in the most highly monotheistic places of worship?

Unhappily the philosophers, whether Western or Eastern, did not discover the one really adorable object of worship ; and no wonder, for the real God-man could not grow in any human brain. He had to come from heaven. The Ideal mankind dreamt of was ever anew disfigured by mythology. Unable to face the historical, or at times the moral, test, those gods were either not really God or, not really man. Greece, Rome and Egypt claimed at most that the divinity had appeared in a diluted form, in the material envelope of Jupiter, Mithras, Osiris, Attis, Ammon, etc. Those myths *seemed* to be God or *seemed* to be men, but, in the words of the leaders of the sects, they were either not really men or not really God.

Hindus, too, have been in search of a God-man. In fact, they have never been surpassed in their human efforts to find Him. They built up the *Avatar* theories with a definite series of *avatars*, animate or inanimate in form. With the Hindus of to-day we will consider only the noblest of the *avatars* : Krishna. Is Krishna a real man ? The classical leaders of the sects have always held that he is not. His human nature is but the form of the divine nature. Vallabha, for instance, tells us of God revealing the form of Krishna's beautiful body adapted to the worshippers. We do not argue about the moral character of Krishna ; for the religious consciousness soon idealized or argued away its objectionable features ; neither do we inquire here into the history of Krishna ; every Hindu scholar knows him to be the product of long centuries of evolution. What we wish to point out here is that the best thinkers of the *bhakti* movement have always held that the human nature of Krishna was but an unreal disguise. His body and soul are creations of *mâyâ*. He does not assume a body from *prakriti* (as in the theory all spirits do before becoming men). He only brings down from heaven (God's own plane) a pre-existing *visuddha sattva* body, which does not make him human in the sense an ordinary soul is human. Besides, in Krishna there is no question of a human

finite soul. Great and beautiful as the Krishna conception is, it falls short of the deepest ideal of our human souls, because in this theory God wishes merely to *act* like a man, without condescending to *be* a man. He does not really suffer and die for us and with us. — “Like an actor Krishna plays the part of a man ; but he is not a man since his birth, his failings, his death, are all declared to be but appearances. His birth is “*Devakîjanmavâda*” which means that he is reputed to be born but is not really born” (JOHANNES). Hence in this theory God does not condescend to be a real man.¹

And yet the wonder is that all those men have hankered after, and dreamt of, a God who would come on earth as a man. Impelled by the law of love, the best men in India have always tried to find a substitute for the great ideal which alone could satisfy them. This ideal was the Christ. In Him, God truly became man. To the incurable disease of anthropomorphism, God has brought the remedy by adapting Himself to our human way of thinking, viz. by truly becoming man.

Here is the Christ, the God-man. Henceforth, in order to know God, the best way is to study Christ. More is to be learned about the infinite God by looking at Christ, by listening to Him, than by the most powerful philosophic speculation about the *Actus Purus* or the *Saccidânanda* of the philosophers.

1. These few points are made in order to guard us against sweeping identifications.

IN CHRISTIANITY OUR HUMAN WAY OF SUFFERING IS NOT WASTED

Of all the services which religion renders to us, the greatest perhaps, after the one of sanctifying us and leading us to heaven, is the one of consoling us. Many of us have to go through a world of tears. What has religion to say and which is the religion that can tell me where my tears come from, and which is the religion that can wipe those tears away? Suffering is unavoidable in any human life. But it is especially patriots and social leaders that must needs be prepared for a life of suffering. But God has become man and suffered like a man. By that very fact He has instilled into human suffering a new meaning as well as a divinizing energy.

The guarantee of this is the fact that He became a real man, who took our suffering upon Himself. His human suffering was not a play. Staged suffering would leave us cold; especially in our own hours of trial. Staged suffering and staged sympathy with men and women who really have suffered in life may look real mockery at times.

But Christ in His suffering was in dead earnest. He really could suffer as we, because He was a man as we. He has felt hunger and thirst. He has felt the pang of separation from a beloved mother. He has felt the shame and filth of a whole world concentrate into His own soul. He was betrayed by a friend. He freely died on a Cross. He has not shirked pain. No show! no sham! He who could have been of rock in the face of suffering has simply suffered as a man, and we know that He has wept.

He does not ask us to suffer as Stoics, like statues of bronze.. He wishes us to suffer in a human way. Even when we have to bend our rebellious nature,

He does not wish us to destroy it, but rather wishes to see it grow unto true life.

Through His Passion and Death, Jesus wished to become more similar to us (HEB. ii, 17.). And by taking up our cross joyfully, or at least with courage, we can become more like Him.

Throughout the centuries both toiling millions and leaders of men have joyfully taken upon their shoulders the crosses of life. They have gone through the battle of life with a smile on their faces in spite of immense trouble and difficulties, because they knew that the crowned King marched ahead of them, showing the way (1 PET. ii, 21 ; ROM. viii, 32 ; iv, 25 ; v, 9, 10).

In heaven the dimensions of our present cross will measure the degree of our happiness. The heavier the cross, the nearer to God. We like to deserve our perfection and the love of God. It is by His Cross that our Lord has merited for us the right to possess God ; it is by our cross that we shall participate in His right and call God our reward and our crown. How justly proud we shall feel when God will tell us He owes it to our love that our soul has become His paradise. And then we shall look at the cross of our Lord and at our own and understand it all.

Ye who weep, come to Jesus, for acquainted is He
with grief.

Ye who suffer, come to Him, for rest can He give,
and relief.

Ye who tremble, come to Him, for His smile from
fear secures.

Ye who pass, oh ! come to Him, for eternally
He endures.

OUR HUMAN WAY OF PRAYING IS THE ONE REQUIRED FOR CHRISTIANITY

Why, henceforth, treat God as an immense abstraction? Why treat Him as someone far away when He has come so near to us? God has become man! The whole of Religion is summarized in that formula of ennoblement and civilization for our race. God has become man and next to the divinity the supreme value is man. Speak to Jesus in your own human way, with sincerity and simplicity. You may speak to Him about your love for Him, about your great desires, about your motherland, about your faults; you may speak to Him even about the crops in the fields and the success in an examination. It is as if God were to say to you: "I too am a man, and nothing human, however small, is insignificant to me, because every man is infinitely precious in my sight."

This was the experience of a Japanese lady after her baptism when she said: "Now I know at last to whom I am talking." Speak to Him as to a friend; unburden your heart to this Man, and never will you be considered importunate. By so speaking to Jesus, you will have adored God in the way He wishes to be adored since His Incarnation.

THE LOVE JESUS REQUIRES FROM US IS OUR HUMAN LOVE

How can I love an infinite God? How can a finite being love the Infinite who is without shape or form? It looks so impossible! But God has made it so easy for us in the Incarnation. Henceforth the

simplest and greatest way of loving God is to love Christ with a human love : first, to love Christ in Himself ; secondly, to love Him in every man.

TO LOVE GOD IN CHRIST

Nothing is more connatural to the human heart. The whole *Bhakti* movement in India has been but one mighty attempt at bringing God closer to the human heart. The efforts of Ramanuja and Vallabha and others are a proof that "Indians possess the God-man in their ideal, in their religious aspirations",² but such an ideal, beautiful though it be, cannot create the Reality, which has come from Heaven. It wholly depends on God whether He will or will not reveal Himself as a real man. The aspirations of the ideal heart have always to be tested by the rigorous dictates of objective truth, and we can approve of the ideal aspirations of the ideal heart only in case they have been tested by truth. Experience shows that human love is not lasting, if it is based only on a fancy of the imagination. The human heart wants reality. Now, the objective Reality for which the hearts of men are ever longing is Jesus Christ. He is not the product of human aspirations ; He is their Source. His love is not fancy ; He does not try to capture our hearts by clever devices and experiences. Love is indeed earnest when the Lover is a real man ready to die out of love, nailed with hands and feet on a Cross. The Indian ideal of self-sacrificing love finds its consummation only in Christ. In Christ the Indian *bhakta* will find his full and satisfying object. In Him all the sins of the world have worked themselves out in an agony of body and soul. He took

2. Cf. P. JOHANNES, *Light of the East*, July, 1930.

upon Himself all our sins and the whole weight of our sorrows. Christ had said one day: "No one has greater love than he who gives his life for his friends", but He has given His life for men who were positively worthy of dislike, for guilty and ungrateful children.

For twenty years have I meditated on the fact that the God-man has died for me on the Cross; yet the subject is ever more fascinating and more striking — and no one will blame me if I confess that I have shed tears, not only of endearment but of pity, over my Jesus who has condescended to surrender Himself up to this point for me, an unworthy sinner. If anybody asks me how to love the Invisible God, I have but one answer: Look at Jesus! He has not only ideal features. He is the Ideal. Love is central and supreme in Him. He has redeemed us not only from the consequences of sin, but from the guilt of sin!

He has surrendered Himself for you totally! He alone is worthy to capture fully the passion of your love. In Him God has died out of love for you. In Him "Love itself hangs on the Cross, a corpse between heaven and earth." — JOHANNES.

The synthesis of Redemption on the part of God is Love! Can you say in all earnest to God that the synthesis of your religion is true love? Before answering, remember that love is not proved by mere words. True love is proved by deeds! Ask yourself:

What have I done for Christ?

What am I doing for Christ?

What shall I do for Christ?

Christ chooses those that choose Him!

THE SECOND WAY OF LOVING JESUS IS TO LOVE HIM IN OUR NEIGHBOUR

No worship has such power over the heart of God as the love of man for man in the name of Christ. In fact, by the Incarnation of God in Christ, every man has been affected and the cause of man has become the cause of God. We must venerate and love God in every man, however poor or miserable, whatever his caste or creed, because every man is similar in some way to the God who has become man. Every man bears the resemblance at least of the humanity of Christ.

No test of our unconditional faith in Christ equals the test of charity towards our neighbour. True Christian charity is not a mere show of philanthropy; Christian charity divinizes in some way our love towards men. That is why true Christian charity in a truly Christian heart can reach a summit of perfection and heroism which simple altruism cannot hope to attain, or attains only in exceptional cases. Experience shows in both Christian and non-Christian that mere altruism stops short as soon as self-advertisement finds no food to feed upon.

But go to the "Little Sisters of the Poor" (you will find them in Calcutta, in Bangalore and in other towns of India), to the "Sisters of Charity" and a legion of similar associations scattered throughout the world, and ask those cultured ladies — often noble by birth and always noble of heart — why in the bloom of life they became the servants of the poor, the beggar, the old, the blind, the cripple, the deaf and dumb, the leper and consumptive, the prisoner and the sinful women, the toiling millions of the slums of our great cities or humble villages? Ask them why they sacrificed joyfully, though with a pang in their hearts, their beauty, time, health, fortune, family, the sweet company of children — and, each and

all, they will tell you that it was out of love for Jesus Christ. Charity towards their fellow men and women has become a form of worship in them. In fact, it requires the belief in, and the love of, Christ to make us ready always and before ever thing else to serve lovingly in spite of ingratitude and contradiction.

The French philosopher Bergson has truly said: "No motive short of love of God can logically provoke and sustain a love of humanity that is truly genuine and universal."

If in the spirit of Christ we are devoted towards our brethren, whosoever they be, Christian or non-Christian -- we practise the religion of the God-man.

CHRIST : CHRISTIANITY

We conclude that Christianity is human in the fullest sense of the word. That is why it is the perfect religion of man.

But Christianity is not only human; it is also divine. The fact that it is so perfectly human flows as a direct result from the fact that it is united to the Divinity just as Christ is the perfect Man because His humanity is united to His divinity. Hence, in the religion of Christ we shall find the same contrasts as in Christ Himself. Christianity exalts human nature, but it is reared on the foundation of humility. Christianity respects all our forces and faculties and energies, but in order finally to surrender them to God. Christianity gives to our human souls an immense reach, but it does so whilst claiming a total self-abnegation and self-surrender. The fullest development of our souls and complete abnegation are united harmoniously in our unique act of adoration. Our confidence can have no limit, because God, by becoming man, has made us in a sense like unto Him.

In Christianity God remains everything and man remains everything. That is why Christianity is wholly human and wholly divine, yet one in Jesus Christ and through Him. Herein lies one of the great attractions of true Christianity. Men have been forcibly attracted to Christ because they felt that by trusting Christ there was no possibility of error ; that on the contrary they would fully realize themselves in the God-man. It has been the same with Christianity. The human in Christianity has been so sublime that the divinity always shone through it. That is why it is not necessary to prove Christianity by long syllogisms. Let it be known for what it is, and all true seekers of God will embrace it with their whole heart and soul.

True Christianity is nothing else but the religion of the God-man ; it is the reflexion of Christ and therefore possesses in itself the whole power and vitality of Christ Himself. Man and Christianity face one another as question and answer.

THE "DHARMA" OF HUMANITY

Compared with other religions, Christianity is not one more religion ; it is not even a better religion amongst other religions less good ; it is *the* religion, the whole of Religion. It differs from other religions not only in degree but in essence. Christianity is religion in a different way. It unites us to God, not through our inefficient human efforts, but rather through the whole force of God in Christ. Certainly it is true, thank God, that Christianity has some points in common with other religions — external practices or institutions such as fasting, praying, alms-giving, exterior public worship, the sacrificial system, monasteries. Analogies are not an objection to, but an argument for, Christianity. Christ willed all these

because He wanted His religion to be a human religion, for men, not merely a religion for pure spirits. But it should be noted that those practices, even when materially identical with those in non-Christian religions, assume in Christianity a new meaning and an extreme dignity because they are sanctified by Christ who alone can attach divine everlasting value to anything we humans may do. No one except God can make our acts proportionate to the Divine Vision.

WHAT IS THE ATTITUDE OF CHRISTIANITY TOWARDS OTHER RELIGIONS ?

1. What is our attitude towards a religion which claims to be satisfied with a purely natural knowledge of God as we know him through reason, to the exclusion of any revelation? A Christian's attitude is not contempt. For we, too, admit that natural knowledge of God and that natural hankering of the soul after God. Between a purely natural religion, if we may so express ourselves, and the Christian Religion there is no opposition. Both are from God. On the other hand, Christianity is not a kind of addition to natural religion. It is much more. It is the necessary internal completion of natural religion, a completion which intensifies and perfects in a transcendent way the very essence of natural religion. The natural religion is assumed, ennobled, and divinized in Christianity, as our human nature is assumed, ennobled, and divinized in Christ. That is why to despise natural religion would be a blasphemy against Christ; but to rest content with it when Christ has come would be a crime against natural religion itself, and hence a crime against God. The essence of natural religion is a call of man to God. Therefore

when God has come, natural religion has to go to Him if it is faithful to itself.

2. What does a Christian think of the historical religions which exist or have existed?

These religions are concrete ways in which men have conceived or practised natural religion. On a common basis of a call to God, a hankering after God — which is the essence of natural religion — these religions are either schisms from natural religion or have added their various interpretations, rites and gestures which at times are sublime, at times sensual and unworthy. It would be un-Christian to condemn these religions wholesale as a heap of errors. The foundation of many of these religious movements has remained sound; it is a hankering after God (which in particular cases God may have rewarded with His grace). The whole of profane history is centred around Christ. The history of religions has necessarily followed the same direction and, in as far as it did, it has been right.

It is a lie to say that all virtue is found with the Christian and all vice with the non-Christian. Moral weakness — facts prove it — is found on both sides. But what is true is that all good and meritorious deeds, done by Christian or non-Christian, were done with the help of Christ's grace, and all the men that have been saved were saved through Jesus Christ.

Even the idolator must not be condemned wholesale. If he errs, it is not because he searches on this earth for an object which is both material and divine; for, such a Being exists. If he errs, it is because he thinks too soon that he has found this object, and does not lead his desire for a material-divine object far enough. Let him but follow up his tendency to its natural outcome, the living Jesus Christ, and idolatry will be a thing of the past. A Christian is allowed, *and has a duty*, to respect all that is truly healthy, strong, and religious in other religions. Man does not cease to be a man by becoming a Christian. Just as he keeps his language, so he keeps all that

is noble and true in his religious thought and feeling. He owes this to Christ who alone realizes in its fullness the particles of truth scattered throughout the world, who alone is the point of contact, unique and perfect between God and men. The most lofty speculation, the most fervent prayer, can never lead us to God unless God first bows down to us. That He did in Christ. Only Christ is the mediator between the finite and the infinite.

From the above it follows that if anyone wants to be in living communion of grace with Christianity, he has not to give up anything truly religious. Christianity has, or rather is, the fullness of Religion.

It follows that there is no direct opposition between Christianity and those religions. Neither is there continuity, except in so far as grace outside Christianity works in the souls of all sincere men in order to lead them to the unique Saviour. The God-man and His Religion are the outcome of no human or natural effort. They come from heaven, and they wish to and are able to lead us to heaven.

We conclude with Bergson : " Christianity is the Religion of Humanity." And this is true even before men accept it, because whether we wish it or not God has become man in Christ. In the words of St. Augustine * "... Truth itself, the Son of God, by taking up manhood, without laying down His Godhead (*homine assumpto, non Deo consumpto*) established and founded this faith"... Christ is the Head of the human race, the unique mediator between heaven and earth. The greatness of Christ is the greatness of true Christianity. Only Christ gives to Christianity its greatness and power of expansion. Only Christ makes of Christianity the religious charter — the *dharma* of Humanity, the *Sanatana Dharma*.

Dear Reader, Christ wishes you to become a son, a daughter, of God, indeed. Will you, dare you answer His call? Young India, Bharat, will you listen to Him?

3. Cf. *Civitas Dei*, Book XI, Chapter II.

AH, where am I to find Him,
The Man of my Heart ?
Alas, since I lost Him,
I wander in search of Him,
Thro' lands near and far.

BAUL

Catholicism

The Whole

Of Christianity

THE CHURCH IS CHRIST CONTINUED

SO FAR we have seen that religion is the whole of man and that Christianity is the whole of religion. Now we must take the last step in our reasoning and say that, unless it be thwarted or stopped half-way, Christianity can only be Catholicism.

Two statements we make :

1. Christ is not the full Christ without the Church which continues Him.
2. The Church which continues Him is the Catholic Church.

We should recall to mind that the Christ who espoused our human nature was the great Preacher of the Kingdom. In fact, the Kingdom was the summary of His whole message. At present we shall have to study deeper the abyss of "riches" and "wisdom" which that word contains in the mind of Jesus Christ.

First, remember how intimately the Kingdom was connected with Christ. In fact, it was not something exterior to Christ ; in its deepest meaning it was Christ Himself, and He promised that He would remain actively present in that Kingdom until the end of time. Christ

being the Heart of the Kingdom, we must expect to find in the Kingdom the same contrasts of divinity and humanity as we find in Jesus Christ. And in fact, in the mind of Jesus Christ and in imitation of Christ, the Kingdom was to be both invisible and visible, both eternal and temporal, both divine and human.

At present we will consider the Kingdom's two main features: It is both visible and invisible. The invisible Kingdom has been called by the earliest Christian writers the "Mystical Body of Christ"; the visible Kingdom has been called the visible Church of Christ.

THE INVISIBLE KINGDOM : THE MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST

Constantly Christ had to correct the too human notions of His apostles about the Kingdom. He flies into the mountain when the crowds want to offer Him a terrestrial kingdom. He opposes His Kingdom, not to earthly kingdoms, but to the spirit of this world. What then is His Kingdom to be? The kernel of the Kingdom is the union of all men with God through their incorporation in Christ. That is why the Kingdom is so intimately connected with the Saviour. It will consist in a perpetual presence of Jesus in the midst of His own, nay in the very souls of His followers. So intimate will be that union between Christ and His own, that on the last day, when as supreme Judge He will pronounce a definite sentence on the human race, He will do so in a proposition that identifies Him and His own. It is because He lives (or should live) in the souls of all men that He will be able to say: "I was hungry, and you gave me to eat: I was thirsty, and you gave me to drink: I was a stranger, and you

took me in, I was in prison, and you came to me" (MATT. xxv, 35, 36).

The great doctrine of St. Paul round which all the others centre is the indwelling of Christ in the soul of Christians. "I live, no not I, Christ liveth in me." At least a 164 times in the few letters of his which have come down to us do we meet those mysterious words "in Christ" or "in Christ Jesus". Paul teaches that Christ lives not only in him but in the soul of all Christians. All Christians are united to Christ as members to the head. The whole is the Mystical Body of Christ. Who was Paul? He was first a great and cultured Pharisee. He it was who had consented to the death of the first Christian martyr Stephen. He had seen the heavenly look of Stephen and heard his last words: "Behold I see the heavens open and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." Yet, Paul did not yet have the Faith, and continued to work out his hatred against the Christian Church. Next, having asked letters from the high-priest of Jerusalem, he was on the way to Damascus to bring all Christians captive to Jerusalem. As he rode at the head of a band of soldiers, he was suddenly struck down by a powerful and shining light, and falling on the ground, he heard a voice saying: "Saul,¹ Saul, why persecutest thou Me?" Paul answered "Who art thou, Lord?" and He said: "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." The voice of Christ did not say: "Why persecutest thou the Christians?" But it said: "Why persecutest thou me?" Paul was to explain that vision afterwards, as he sailed the high seas, crossed and recrossed Asia Minor, Greece and Rome, announcing everywhere that Jesus has identified Himself with His own, that He continues to live in His followers who are in the state of grace, and that in Christ there is no longer any difference between Greeks and Barbarians, men and women, learned or unlearned, because all are actual or possible members of the Mystical Body of Christ.

1. Saul is Paul's original name.

A contemporary of Paul was John, apostle and evangelist. He knew Jesus, for it was he who had rested his head on the Heart of the Master at the Last Supper. He too describes the same reality. Christ is the Light : We see in Him and through Him. Christ is the Life : We live in Him and through Him. He remains in us and we in Him. These are not pious metaphors. One can hardly imagine plainer language than the last words of Jesus Himself in His discourse at the Last Supper, where He describes the Mystical Body of Christ under the image of a Vine, of which His followers are the branches.

" I am the true Vine.....

I am the Vine, you the branches.

Abide in me : and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, unless it abide in the vine, so neither can you, unless you abide in me.

If anyone abide not in me : he shall be cast forth as a branch, and shall wither, and they shall gather him up."

JOHN XV, 1 ff.

Christ asks that, as He is one with the Father, so too we may be one with Him. The union of His followers with the divinity is evidently only a participated union. The Christians remain distinct personalities. The fruits are produced both by Christ and by the individual Christians, yet it remains that Christ lives in the Christians as the tree lives in the branches.

* * *

Christian seers and saints have meditated for centuries on this immense mystery of love : the vivification of all men through Christ ; and giant minds as Irenæus, Athanasius, Hilary, Cyril of Alexandria, Cyprian, Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, etc., have always found in this doctrine the heart of Christianity.

I will quote only a few lines from Saint Ignatius of Antioch, martyred between 98-117 in the reign of the Emperor Trajan. This venerable Bishop of

Antioch was arrested and taken to Rome in chains to be thrown before the wild beasts in the amphitheatre. By slow stages the old man was led by a band of cruel soldiers. On the way he makes time to write a few letters of consolation, letters which after so many centuries are still warm with the breath of genuine faith and love.

To the Ephesians, he writes :

"Let us therefore do all things in the assurance that He dwells within us, that we may be His shrines, and He Himself may dwell in us as God."

In his letter to the Romans, he asks the Christians not to intercede for his release :

"Forgive me, Brethren, hinder me not from entering into life...Suffer me to receive pure light..... Suffer me to be an imitator of the passion of my God. *If any man has Him dwelling in him*, let him understand what I desire, and have fellow-feeling with me, knowing what constrains me. For I write unto you, in the midst of life enshrouded of death. My love has been crucified and there is not within me any fire of earthly desire but only Water that lives in me and speaks in me and says from within me : 'Come hither to the Father'....."

The "mystery" (Mystical Body of Christ) is before everything else a prodigy of unity ; God has raised to a supernatural unity the ordinary unity which men possess by nature. Henceforth we are all called to be one in Christ ; but one in such a transcendental unity, that men through their own forces would never have been capable of reaching it. This unity takes hold of our whole being ; it binds us together one with another, the poorest with the richest, the dead and the living ; it unites each and all to God. Through Christ and in Christ we can truly and efficaciously pray for one another ; we become co-citizens of the same Kingdom ; we become co-heirs of heaven. Through Christ, in Christ, we deepen our spiritual life and become in a sense divinized with that divinization which affects the substance of ourselves. At the same time this

divinization claims a higher active sanctity in us, a greater purity, and above all, a greater charity and sense of social justice. In Christ we must live for God and also for our brethren because we live with them in Christ ; because all men are actual or possible members of the same Mystical Body. If we refuse to do so, we ourselves wither into dead wood.

No term nor comparison is strong or rich enough to carry the full meaning of the "mystery", which is on the part of God a prodigy of goodness and wisdom, and from our point of view a prodigy of transfiguration, of life, of holiness, and especially of unity.

THE VISIBLE KINGDOM : THE CHURCH

But the Kingdom was to be not only divine ; like Christ and in imitation of Him, it was to be also human and visible. As it is Christ's humanity, united to the divinity, which is really the source of all grace, in the same way, it is the visible Church of Christ which is the source and guarantee of that grace that is the Life of the world. It is through the visible Church that Christ wishes men to be incorporated into His Mystical Body.

It is clear from history that Christ wished His Kingdom to be not only invisible but also visible. It was inaugurated by the preaching of Christ Himself. This new Kingdom would be visible and organized like a seed, and would grow until the end of time. It is compared to a field containing good and bad weeds ; to a fisher's net containing useful and useless fish. The separation of the good and the bad members of the Kingdom will take place in public at the end of time. He Himself is the Shepherd of this distinct Flock. The Kingdom is meant not for pure spirits but

for men composed of body and soul. Presently He compares it to a mighty tree, the recognized metaphor of the time for a mighty Kingdom. And this Kingdom, the new nation of God, is meant for the whole world, for East and West alike. "And I say to you that many shall come from the East and the West, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven" (MATT. viii, 11).

It would be a mistake to imagine that Christ came down on earth in order to preach personally the Gospel of salvation to all men. In this, as in everything else, He treats men in a human way and He wishes His Gospel to spread in a human way. Therefore He at first chose twelve apostles, the twelve whom He trained personally with infinite care and devotion. One day He invested these men and their successors with the world-mission of Christianity when He spoke those terrible and great words, just before His Ascension: "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Going therefore teach all nations: baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world" (MATT. xxviii, 18-20).

In these and similar words Christ conferred on His apostles the power of teaching; He sent them into the world with the same message and authority as His own (JOHN xiii, 20). He promises to send them the Spirit of Truth which will teach them and make them witnesses of God and will preserve them from error. On the other hand, He enjoins on all men to listen to them (JOHN xvii, 20, 21).

After the Ascension we see the Apostles constantly appealing to this Christ-given authority of preaching the Gospel (ACTS. xv, 18; 2 COR. xiii, 3).

But Christ conferred on His apostles not only the power of teaching authoritatively His message; He also clothed the twelve and their successors with the full power of forgiving sins, of incorporating men into

the Kingdom, of administering the sacraments, of consecrating the Eucharist and of consecrating priests and bishops as their successors. And to Peter, as to a rock, He attached in unmistakable terms the primacy of leadership and of power. Peter is to be the source of authority and the guarantee of Christ's doctrine in the Kingdom. Christ had first promised this power to Peter on that solemn day when Peter made his profession of faith in the divinity of Christ, with the words: "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God." It was on that occasion that Jesus answered Peter:

"Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona: because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say to thee: Thou art Peter (rock); and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven" (MATT. xvi, 17-19).

This power — which Christ promised on this occasion under the threefold metaphor of a "rock", "handing over the keys" and "binding and loosing" — was conferred actually after the Resurrection, when Christ confided to Peter's pastoral care the whole of the flock, the whole of the Kingdom. It happened on the shores of the sea of Tiberias. Several apostles were present and "Jesus saith to Simon Peter: Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than these? He saith to him: Yes, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him: Feed my lambs.

"He saith to him again: Simon, son of John, lovest thou me? He saith to him: Yes, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him: Feed my lambs.

"He said to him the third time: Simon, son of John, lovest thou me?" Peter was grieved because he had said to him the third time: Lovest thou me? And he said to him: Lord, thou knowest all

things; thou knowest that I love thee. He said to him: Feed my sheep" (JOHN XXI, 15-17).

And Peter will one day give his life for the sheep of the Flock of Christ. He died at Rome about the year 67 as attested by Ignatius, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian and many others, in fact, by the whole Catholic tradition. — Peter had chosen Rome to become the centre and permanent Headquarters of the Church.

* * *

History proves that from the very first, viz. before the year A.D. 50 the visible kingdom of Christ was known as a distinct organized body of men, with special worship, with definite sacraments and with a unique world-mission. From the very first that body of men was centred round a Christ-appointed priesthood, round the bishops and round the Pope, the successor of Peter.

I do not propose to discuss this historical proof. I only wish to point out that modern research work, and especially the study of the "great historic gap" between A.D. 90 and 180, has broken down for ever the old Protestant argument that Protestantism was conformable to the most ancient practice of Christianity. The conclusions of Dr. Adolph Harnack, the most illustrious Protestant historian Germany has produced, were really startling for Protestantism. See what he wrote in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Jan. 16, 1909:

"Some of the principal elements of Catholicism go back to the apostolic age", and "it is possible to establish by impressive proofs, that the Catholic concept of the infant Church is historically the true one, i.e. that *Christianity, Catholicism and Romanism are in the light of history perfectly identical.*"

This was the first time that a Protestant theologian uttered a proposition so diametrically opposed to the traditional contention of his Church. The im-

portance of his general declaration is great, and Harnack's article has been reproduced in its entirety and critically examined by Batiffol in *Primitive Catholicism* P. IX, pp. 94-113.

Let no one think that the visible organization prevented the full working of the spirit of Christ. If ever there was a man led by the spirit of Christ, it was St. Paul. Yet Paul's letters betray a hierarchical organization of the visible Church, and when points of doctrine were at stake, he appealed to the first Pope, Peter, to settle the matter. Christ spoke through Peter just as, in 451 at Chalcedon, Peter spoke through Leo.³

It is outside the scope of this sketch to go through the hosts of mystics and saints who flourished in the hierarchical Church of Christ, men or women—as St. Francis of Assisi, St. John of the Cross, Catherine of Sienna, the Little Flower—who, far from being hampered, were immensely helped and safeguarded against illusions, through the directions of the visible Church of Christ. I just mention again St. Ignatius of Antioch. We have seen what a passionate lover he was of Christ living in the souls of the Christians, yet this man wrote in a hierarchical spirit to a strongly organized Church. Remember he died between 98-117:

To the Smyrnaeans he writes:

"Let the Eucharist be considered valid which is under the bishop or him to whom he commits it. Wheresoever the bishop appears, there let the people be."

To the Trallians:

"Let all reverence the deacons as Jesus Christ, as also the bishop, regarding him as a type of the Father and the presbyters as the Council of God and the band of Apostles. Without these, there is no Church deserving the name."

3. When the famous letter of Pope St. Leo I had been read at the Council of Chalcedon (IV), all the bishops exclaimed: "Peter has spoken through Leo."

To the Ephesians :

"It is fitting that you put yourselves in harmony with the mind of the bishop as indeed you do. For your noble presbytery, worthy of God, is fitted to the bishop as the strings to a harp. And thus by means of your concord and harmonious love, Jesus Christ is sung."

To the Church of Rome he writes :

"Ignatius, who is also Theophoros, — to her that has found mercy in the bounteous power of the Father most high and Jesus Christ, His only Son — to the Church that is beloved and illuminated by the will of Him that willed all things which exist in faith and love towards Jesus Christ, our God — to her that has the chief place among the Church. . . ."

* * *

To sum up : according to the epistles and doctrine of Ignatius of Antioch, the man of Unity :

The unity of the Church is the unity of Christ Himself. This unity is both spiritual and corporal as the Lord has been. Ignatius warns the Christians against those who attack the visible unity. The visible unity of the Church is as evident and necessary as the flesh of Christ. The divinity and humanity of Christ are continued in His Church. Christians should pray round the same altar, breaking the same bread, holding the same faith, in peace among themselves and in obedience to their spiritual heads as to Christ. Without the bishop, no Eucharist, no remission of sins ; without his advice, no baptism or marriage ; all the priests must obey him and love him. In him the sacramental life and the visible unity of the Church are concentrated. The exterior unity of the Church is but the outside of an interior unity (Mystical Body of Christ) which is the heart of Christian Unity. The intermediaries of that unity are the bishops. The source of that unity is Christ in God. The Holy Ghost produces that unity in our souls. This unity is nourished by the Eucharist.

This is the doctrine of St. Ignatius of Antioch.

THE EUCHARIST: THE KERNEL OF THE KINGDOM

Nowhere is the intimate union of the visible and the invisible kingdoms better illustrated and realized than in the Eucharist.

Is that the reason why the Eucharist is to the Christian a fountain of joy, and the source of his finest feelings? Every Catholic knows that in true Christianity the Eucharist is, and has always been, the centre of worship. He feels that without the Eucharist, that ray of heaven, Christian churches would become mere halls for singing hymns. He knows that without the Eucharist, the world would freeze into a vast iceberg floating in a dark sea.

A high-class and highly cultured Bengali lady who, after a heroic fight for her soul's freedom, joined a Catholic convent of *sanyasinis* in France, wrote the following prayers in honour of her Jesus in the Eucharist :

PRIE-DIEU POEMS

A THOUGHT

The deeper the darkness,
The brighter the Morn ;
The spirit's rare gladness
Of sorrow is born.
The fiercer the tempest,
The sooner the calm ;
The sharper the wound,
The more soothing the balm.

The brightest of blossoms
Lie close to the sod,
The lowliest hearts
Are dearest to God.
The heaviest cross
That to earth bows us down,
If patiently borne,
Wins a glorious crown.

RABBONI

When I am dying
How glad I shall be
That the Lamp of my Life
Has been burned out for Thee,
That sorrow has darkened
The pathway I trod,
That thorns — not roses —
Were strewn o'er its sod ;
That anguish of spirit
Full often was mine
Since anguish of spirit
So often was Thine.
My cherished Rabboni
How glad I shall be
To die with the hope
Of the welcome from thee.

THE QUIET HOUR

My heart is tired, so tired to-night.
How endless seems the strife
Day after day the restlessness of all this weary life !
I come to lay the burden down
That so oppresses me,
And shutting all the world without
To spend an hour with Thee, Dear Lord,
To spend an hour with Thee
I would forget a little while
The bitterness of tears,
The anxious thoughts that crowd my life,

The buried hope of years ;
Forget that mortal's weary toil
My patient care must be.
A tired child I come to-night,
To spend an hour with Thee, Dear Lord,
To spend an hour with Thee.

A foolish wayward child, I know,
So often wandering ;
A weak, complaining child, but oh
Forgive my murmuring ;
And fold me to Thy Sacred Breast,
Thou who has died for me,
And let me feel 'tis peace to rest
A little hour with Thee, Dear Lord,
A little hour with Thee.
One little hour with Thee.

The busy world goes on and on,
I cannot heed it now
Thy Sacred Hand is laid upon
My aching, throbbing brow,
Life's toil will soon be past and then
From all its sorrows free,
How sweet to think that I shall spend
Eternity with Thee, Dear Lord,
Eternity with Thee.

AFTER HOLY COMMUNION

I have sought Thee, I have found Thee,
Lamb of Mercy, Holy Guest ;
Thy eternal love has bound Thee,
Captive in a mortal breast.
Oh that I had sooner tasted
Joys, I never knew before ;
Oh had I the youth I wasted,
Back again to live it o'er.
Oh that I had sooner known Thee,
Oh that I could the past recall,
Yet Thou wilt not now disown me,
Father of the Prodigal ;

To my breast Thy Son descending
Sweetly there appeals for me,
Let me then thus humbly bending
Pledge the rest of life to Thee.

— M.D.

Who gave us the Eucharist ?

The Master gave it to humanity in His last gesture upon this earth. The Eucharist is the testament of Jesus to His Kingdom.

His followers, and even some of His disciples, had wavered in their belief when He first announced this Great Gift ; some of them left Him because they did not believe in the possibility of such a love ; and because they did not believe unto the end in God's love, they withered away in black despair.

"I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever : and the bread that I will give, is my flesh for the life of the world.

The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying : How can this man give us his flesh to eat ?

Then Jesus said to them : Amen, amen I say unto you : Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you.

He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life : and I will raise him up in the last day.

For my flesh is meat indeed : and my blood is drink indeed.

He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father ; so he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me. This is the bread that came down from heaven. Not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead. He that eateth this bread shall live for ever " (JOHN vi, 51-59).

* * *

Did Jesus keep this promise? Did He give us His Flesh and Blood? He did!

It happened on the eve of His Passion. The Cross on Calvary loomed high in His mind and in His heart. The next day He would be the Great Mediator between God and men, sacrificing Himself for the redemption of mankind. That was the moment when He gathered the twelve around Him in an upper-room of a friend in Jerusalem. They were all together at the last supper, when suddenly a hush fell upon them all, as they watched Him. Looking up to Heaven, He took bread in His venerable hands, blessed it, broke it and pronounced those wonderful words, incredible had they been spoken by any other man: *This is My Body which is given for you.* And He passed it on to be eaten by the twelve. Next He took the chalice with wine and made the same ritual gesture saying: *This is My Blood which shall be shed for you and for many* (to-morrow on the Cross). And again he passed round the chalice to His disciples.

After this He enjoined upon His apostles and their successors to renew what had been done till the end of time. It was all over. A few lines suffice to give the substance of this fact ; but in that visible gesture Jesus offered up freely and gallantly for the whole of mankind the sacrifice of His Body and Blood, which He had made on the day of His Incarnation and which He would consummate, the next day, on the Cross.

“ For ~~it~~ is impossible that with the blood of oxen and goats sin should be taken away. Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith : Sacrifice and oblation thou wouldest not : but a body thou hast fitted to me : Holocausts for sin did not please thee. Then said I : ‘ Behold I come ’ ” (HEB. x, 4-7).

It has been said : “ No great religion, without a sacrifice. No human religion, without a sacrifice.” Here again Catholicism is the religion of Humanity.

* * *

The Mass is nothing else but the ritual, unbloody renewal of that *one* Sacrifice of Christ, the Eternal Priest and Mediator. The sacrifice and the priesthood

of Catholicism are but participations in the *one* Victim and the *one* Priest who in the last supper "carried His own (sacramental) Body in His holy hands" and who, the next day, died on the Cross as the Unique Mediator between God and man. It should be noted that the sacrifice of the cross and of the altar does not do away with our personal sacrifice. It is not a mere substitute for our sacrifice. On the contrary, it stimulates our personal sacrifice, because we know that we appropriate the fruit of Jesus' sacrifice only in as far as we are ready to sacrifice ourselves for God and for our brethren. But this, our human and limited, sacrifice becomes pleasing to God and proportionate to eternal life, because we offer it through the one High-priest: Jesus Christ, "always living to make intercession for us" (HEB. vii, 25).

The sacrifice of the Mass is the act of worship *par excellence*, whereby we render to God the highest glory, and whereby we realize ourselves and prepare ourselves for a life of sacrifice. By a spiritual assimilation, a spiritual *osmosis*, we assimilate, through the Body and Blood, the Spirit of Christ.

Since that memorable day in human history, the Mass has been offered by anointed hands, white, or black, or brown, in ever wider circles. Persecution drove the Mass more than once underground, into the Roman catacombs, into the secret hiding places of the most English families of England, in the hills of Erin, or in the caves of Japan ; but no one has been — or will ever be — able to wipe it out from this earth. Men and women, rich and poor, nobles and outcasts, learned and unlearned find every day new joy and strength when they kneel before the tabernacle and receive in their hearts their King and Master. The vision of the prophet Malachy has become literally true :

" From the rising of the sun even to the going down thereof, my name is great among the gentiles ; and in every place there is offered to my name a clean oblation " (MAL. i, 11).

In fact, from Japan onwards, right through the immense stretches of China, Siam, through the towns and villages of India, throughout Eastern and Western Europe and Africa, and sweeping across the oceans in North and South America and Australia, in all those places, as the sun rises on the horizon, so too rise the hands of the Catholic priest offering, with Christ and in His name, the one Sacrifice for the salvation of the world.

* * *

I conclude: The Eucharist is the mightiest symbol as well as the most real expression of the Mystical Body of Christ here on earth.

“The chalice, . . . which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord? For we, being many, are one bread, one body, all that partake of one bread” (I COR. x, 16, 17). This is one of many similar quotations of St. Paul. And St. Cyprian: “As a multitude of grains gathered together, ground and kneaded make one bread, so in Christ, who is the Bread of Heaven, we are one Body and in Him our multitude is centred and joined together.”

So many witnesses should be quoted here to show that Christ spoke truly not only of a relation of love but of a “physical participation” in Himself — as Cyril of Alexandria exposed so brilliantly, for instance, in *Dialog. de S. S. Trinitate*. (Migne, P. G. lxxv, 693 — 697). (Cf. *Mersch*, I 433) Christ spoke plainly enough when He said: “He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood remains in me and I in him” (JOHN vi, 56).

The Eucharist is perhaps the most powerful, visible expression and visible source of the invisible Reality in the Church. The Eucharist is the centre of the supernatural world: It contains under visible elements the Author of all grace and glory.

THE GREAT LAW OF REDEMPTION

The great wonder of Christianity is not God (how could He be less than He is?), the great wonder is God-made-man in Jesus Christ; just as the secret of Christianity is not what God can do alone but what He can make us perform through His grace. This joining up of the visible and the invisible, of the divine and the human, is the universal law of our salvation. That is why true Christianity has been called the religion of integral humanism, or rather, of supernatural humanism.

1. The great law is first exemplified and, as it were, incarnate, in Jesus Christ Himself: Christ, who is God, assumes a human nature like unto ours, illuminates our intellect by a doctrine which He normally communicates through audible words or visible writings, and which He guarantees by means of a visible authority on earth.

2 The Church is another example of that great law of Redemption. In fact, the Church is nothing but Christ who continues to live and work in the world. In the mind of Christ, the Church is Christ in His fullness who continues that great process of divinization of the human race till the end of time. Again, it is through a visible Church, visible sacraments, audible words, that He guarantees communion with Him in His Mystical Body. The visible Church is, as it were, the wireless-transmitting station of Christ through which He flashes His grace to all human hearts who want to be united with Him. Young India, do you want that union?

3. The whole world was from the beginning a visible symbol of God's action and, in spite of the Fall, it never ceased to be a vast sacrament of the supernatural action of God.

The aim of the whole of mankind and of creation is the union of all men with God through the God-man,

Jesus Christ. This is the great message of Christ. This is the great feature of Catholicism. This is the source of Catholic Optimism. Matter is not evil in itself ; sin puts disorder into matter, but good is mightier than evil ; grace mightier than sin.

God is interested, not only in a part of us, but in the whole of us ; not only in our souls but also in our bodies. He is interested in the whole of man, in the whole of human society with all its weakness and with all its physical and moral splendour. (We shall see later on the cultural value of this principle.) God is the Creator and Redeemer of mankind and His Church is the visible Church for men and not, as Protestants have said, the invisible Church for souls only : There would be no baptismal grace without heads to receive the flow of water poured by a human hand. There would be no Eucharist without wheat and without grapes, and all the glory of that sacrament is inseparably united to these products of the field. There would be no confirmation for the new Christian, no extreme unction for the dying, without oil and balm spread by the finger of Christ's priest on the skin of a baptized Christian. There would be no absolution from sin, no valid marriage contract without words murmured by mortal lips, and there would be no sacerdotal ordination without the hands of a bishop laid on the head of a deacon. The sacraments are the visible channels of Christ's invisible grace.

In the same way and for the same reason the Bible is not a purely spiritual idea which dwells in a spirit ; it is a great old volume, at first sight rather queer, with long lists of genealogies, proverbs, histories of old wars, songs of Bedouins, evidently a puzzle to any man who has not studied this book for many years. It is a book confided to the care of the visible Church upon earth and whose deepest interpretation was clearly never meant to be left to the swaying moods of different persons and different times.⁴ In

4. Between the invention of printing in 1450 and the first of all Protestant Bibles in 1552, there were 626 editions of the

the scriptures are things " hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest ... to their own destruction " (2 PETER iii, 16).

And Christ, who wished so ardently that His Church should be one, did not create a succession of pure ideas, but He instituted an uninterrupted line of Popes who are men as we, often old men, with human qualities and human defects ; and it is in them that He invested the supreme authority over the visible Church, and to them He gave the last word in case of doubt in matters of Faith and Morals (See JOHN xvi, 13 ; MATT. xviii, 17). People have at times been scandalized at this. They forgot that Christ has the right to found a visible Church, and to establish in that visible Church a perfect human unity centred in one man — the rock, *Peter*. In fact, in that part of the Church which is here on earth, a living man is *required*, visible and real, with flesh and bones. Not only the words of Jesus in the Gospel prove this, but the whole plan of salvation points in the same direction. Here on earth a man is required whose function (not whose person, evidently) be the function of Christ in matters of Faith and Morals. A mere agreement, a mere senate of bishops or patriarchs would never be sufficient to safeguard the unity and the faith which Christ came to bring us. Plain thinking and history show that those senates of bishops vanish in the hour of crisis just when the rallying point for unity should be most visible. On the other hand, a mere spiritual and interior unity is not the one God has chosen, neither does it agree with our human nature which is both visible and invisible.

Bible under the auspices and supervision of the Catholic Church. 198 of these were in modern languages. In German alone there were 29 printed editions of the Bible before Luther's. Nine of these were printed before Luther was born in 1483. In spite of these many editions there was only one Bible as we have it in the Catholic Church to-day : For there is only one Written Word inspired by God for all times and all nations. Hence, there should be only one authentic, complete and reliable Bible for all to-day, and that is essentially the same one which the Catholic Church has preserved for us during nearly 1900 years.

Those who have tried to replace this visible-invisible unity of the Church of Christ by what they call "the spiritual communion of love" have sad tales to tell. They lack the power of initiative and co-operation. To fall to pieces, to drop into schism seems to be in their blood. Their existence can only be maintained by artificially basing their external union upon purely national or ethnic grounds. In place of the one Church of Christ, they become a multiplicity of auto-cephalous national churches. A few examples will suffice to illustrate how the great unit, called Christendom, or Europe, was torn to pieces. If you want to know who did it and for what purpose, I would refer you to historians like Hilaire Belloc and advise you not to rely too much on the standardized type of prescribed English textbooks and literature.

<i>Name</i>	<i>Place of Origin</i>	<i>Founder</i>	<i>Year</i>
Lutheran Germany	... Martin Luther	...1517
Anabaptists Germany	... Nicholas Stork	...1521
Calvinists. (They are known as Presbyterians in Scotland and America; Reformed in Holland; Puritans in England; Congregationalists in America.)	... Switzerland	... John Calvin	...1534
Episcopalians	... England	... Henry VIII	...1534
Unitarian			
Congregationalists	... Germany	... Celarius, about	...1540
Presbyterian (Old School)	Scotland	... General Assembly	...1560
Congregationalists	... England	... Robert Browne	...1583
Baptists	... Rhodes Island	... Roger Williams	...1639
Quakers	... England	... George Fox	...1647
Quakers	... America	... William Penn	...1681
Methodist Episcopal	... England	... John Wesley	...1739
Free-Will Baptists	... New Hampshire	... Benj. Randall	...1780
Free Communion Baptists	New York	... B'jah Corp	Close 18th Cen.
Disciples, or Christians	... Virginia...	... Alex Campbell	...1813
Reformed Methodist	... Vermont	... Branch of the Methodist Episcopal Church	...1814
Methodist Society	... New York	... Do	...1820
Methodist Protestant	... Baltimore	... Do	...1830
Adventist	... United States	... William Miller	...1831
Seven-day Baptists	... United States	... General Conference	...1833
Presbyterian (New School)	Philadelphia	... General Assembly	...1840
True Wesleyan Methodist	New York	... Delegates from Methodist Denomination	...1843
Seventh-day Adventists	... Battle Creek, Mich.	... Mrs. E.G. White	...1845
Spiritualist	... Hydesville, N.Y.	... Fox Family	...1848
Christian Scientists	... Boston, Mass.	... Mrs. Mary B. Eddy	...1879
Re-organized	... Boston, Mass.	... Mrs. Mary B. Eddy	...1892
Catholic Church	... Jerusalem	... Jesus Christ	... 33

That men should abandon a Christ-appointed authority only to become slaves of commissions, Government-appointed Reichbischöfs or parliament! Those men are excusable in so far as it is not they who have chosen this pitiful plight. It was decided for most of them many centuries ago. Still, I well understand Cardinal Manning's remark: "I became a Catholic to escape from the tyranny of men's opinions in matters of Faith."

The Catholic Church is not a plurality of opinions, it is not the resultant of common aspirations nor is it a mere machinery for settling disputes.

Catholic Unity and authority, far from being the resultant of common aspirations, are their source and principle. Our unity comes from above, that is why it pervades the whole visible Church and every part of it. Christ prayed for the one Peter that his faith might not fail (LUKE xxii, 32), and upon the one Peter rests the whole of the visible Church.

In the words of St. Cyprian⁵, there is but "one God, One Christ, One Church, One See founded on Peter by the word of the Lord. There can be but one altar and one priesthood." And elsewhere he says:

"The Spouse of Christ cannot become adulterate. She is undefiled and chaste; owning but one home and guarding with virtuous modesty the sanctity of one chamber. She it is who keeps us to God and appoints unto the Kingdom the sons she has borne. Whosoever parts company with the church and joins himself to an adulteress is estranged from the promises of the Church. . . He can no longer have God for His Father who has not the Church for his Mother."

St. Paul had put the same in a still terser way: "One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism" (EPI. iv, 5).

I conclude that in the matter of unity, as in the Incarnation, as in the whole Church, as in the whole plan of salvation, God attends to us not only in a mere

5. In spite of the one painful misunderstanding the See of Rome was always for Cyprian the "*locus Petri*" and the "*Ecclesia Principalis unde unitas sacerdotalis orta est*".

interior and spiritual way but also in a visible and human manner. This is a capital point and the real point at issue between Protestants and Catholics. *Catholicism is Christian unto the end.*

What gives glory to God is the Church of *men*, men made of earth, and who write in matter the very idea of the Holy Ghost, like artists who cast in matter the idea they wish to portray.

Hence, it is clear that to a Catholic submission to final or provisional decisions in matters of Faith and other ecclesiastical regulations are far from being a restraint; they are the necessary bonds, embraced freely and out of conviction, which help powerfully to keep the members united, both to the visible Church and to the Mystical Body of Christ. Old — as well as new — Catholics will tell you that there is an immense field for freedom of religious thought and action in the Catholic Church. As Dr. Orchard writes in the story of his conversion *From Faith to Faith*, p. 296 ff.:

“Even if freedom is defined as believing what one likes, the good Catholic might reply that he at any rate does not believe anything else. . . . his conviction, that the Church Christ founded can teach nothing but the truth, is believing what he likes to believe ...

“But, as every one knows, we cannot always believe what we would like to believe; in the end we must face facts and believe what is true, for we cannot with safety continue to ignore the craving for mental consistency ...

“On the other hand the worst of all slaveries can soon be discovered to be entailed in giving ourselves over to our passing moods and allowing our superficial desires to dictate our actions.

“There is no prison house or torture chamber like the mind without a master. It will be admitted that the human mind must subject itself to Truth or it will never be free: for this is to obey its own laws.”

THE CHURCH WHICH CONTINUES CHRIST IS THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

I had set out on this chapter with the intention of proving

(1) that Christ is not the full Christ without the Church which continues Him :

(2) that the Church, which continues Him, is the Catholic Church.

But I notice, now, that whilst describing the Church which continues Him, I have described the Catholic Church, and every one will have recognized in the one Church of Christ the Catholic Church. A couple of years ago a prominent Lepcha leader of Kalimpong, Mr. Sitling, decided after long prayer and earnest thought to leave the Scottish Church and to become a Catholic. As happens on such occasions, his decision created a stir, and soon a leaflet was spread in Kalimpong with fifteen reasons for not becoming a Catholic. Mr. Sitling answered with another leaflet stating but one reason why he joined Catholicism. The reason was that the Catholic Church is the Church of Christ.

When a Catholic claims his Church to be the one Church of Christ and consequently claims the whole truth for his religion, it is not pride which makes him speak thus : neither is it a desire to bring other people to his own opinion, since he himself has to obey Truth however great the cost. When a Catholic makes that claim, he simply asserts two incontestable facts which no Christian would dare deny :

(1) That Christ is not absent from the world, and hence that it is still possible to find the Truth.

(2) That the Truth of Christ cannot be cut to pieces, dispersed and scattered among various sects.

Christ is not a booty. He is not a relic which you can divide at will. Truth, when divided, perishes. If

one does not want the whole Christ, one does not have Him at all.

Intolerant Catholic Church! some have said. Truth is intolerant. Monopoly! it has been objected; but since when has Truth been a monopoly? Does a geometer monopolize truth, when he affirms that it is impossible without error to reach any other conclusion than his own? Truth can be assimilated — and Catholicism is meant to be assimilated — by an infinite number of men and women, without being diminished in itself. Error is nothing else but an incomplete truth which one deems sufficient: To divide Truth is to be content with a portion of it, and thus Truth is changed into error, as by dissection a living being becomes a corpse. It is not possible to belong to no church without ceasing to be a follower of the true Christ. On the other hand, it is not possible to belong to all the churches because they are in formal disagreement on some of the most essential points of God's revealed message. Therefore, there must be one Church, which is the centre of Unity, which you cannot divide, and where in peace of soul you can establish contact with the Eternal, knowing that she possesses the truth.

That Church is the Catholic Church.

I have been asked about my religious experience in the Church. It is not my intention to develop this point here. To one thing I can testify before God and before men:

That the Church has been the mightiest experience, both human and divine, of my life.

Through her I feel every day that in spite of my utter unworthiness I am in living communion with Christ. Through Christ and His Church I know that I communicate with all men, with all the actual or possible members of the Mystical Body of Christ.

CATHOLICISM THE WHOLE OF CHRISTIANITY

We conclude: Catholicism is not one of the many Christian religions. Catholicism is *the* Christian Religion. Catholicism is the whole of Christianity. It is "the religion of Humanity". (BERGSON)

What, then, is the attitude of Catholicism towards other Christian religions?

Catholics admit that most of the Christian sects are in possession — some more, some less — of authentic Christian elements. Unhappily a great number of those sects are allowing the tides of materialism or modernism to wrest from their hands this portion of Christ's sacred heirloom.

Is that the reason why Dr. W.E. Orchard exclaims with sadness:

"Outside the Catholic Church, the faith that saves men's souls is being surrendered, forgotten, lost; and apart from the Catholic Faith, Christ is becoming too cloudy to be followed, and fading too far away to be loved"?

Thank God, many sects still possess Christian elements: they believe in the Incarnation, in our unity in Christ with the Father and the Son. They preach the filial attitude of man towards God; they preach confidence, humility, prayer; they know the sign of the cross and what it means; some of them possess even real apostolic rites and true sacraments. These God-given elements keep their transcendent value, whatever be the sins which we Christians have committed throughout the centuries against the unity of the Church of Christ. Wherever those elements are to be found, they claim our loving veneration, and Protestantism on account of these elements is holy.

But the respect and veneration, which all Catholics should have for those Christian elements, and

the sincere love which we all have, or should have, towards our Protestant brethren, cannot make us indifferent towards the full message of Christ and towards His real Self. By the side of these Christian elements which it possesses, Protestantism has placed a negation which bears the mark of the non-divine and of the non-Christian. Protestantism has felt a natural repugnance in admitting that our substance, our acts, our knowledge, our religious unity and its visible centre can be united at all to divine action and can be intrinsically divinized.

If Protestantism were merely the assertion that such a divinization surpasses human nature, it would speak the truth and we should agree. If it doubted only whether this divinization was sufficiently proved, we might have a discussion on the facts. But in reality Protestantism seems to raise an objection of an *a priori* character. In other words, it says: Our human nature is not capable of such a greatness; it is a blasphemy to unite God so closely to matter and to nothingness. A similar objection was addressed one day to Jesus: "Thou, being a man, makest thyself God" (JOHN x, 33).

And in fact, to refuse belief in the real and intrinsic union of the human and the divine in the Christian and in the Church leads logically to refusing the same belief in the great pattern and foundation of this union, the Man-God in the Incarnation. Yet Protestantism wishes to believe in the Incarnation. Hence, Protestantism is drawn to pieces between two diverse poles; on the one hand, its faith in an Incarnate God, and on the other, disbelief in the same Incarnate God as He continues to live in His Church.

Which will carry the day in this internal struggle? The Faith or the Unbelief? the affirmation or the negation? If out of respect for God and out of contempt for man the divine be separated from the human in the heart of the Christian or in the heart of the Church, the same reasons hold good for the separation of the human and the divine in Christ Himself. And then

Protestantism will have to write into its creed the dogma of the "Adi-Brahmo Samaj": "God has never become incarnate."

But if Protestantism reaches this stage and separates the divine from the human in Christ, can it be logical and stop there? No. For if Christ be a mere man, then God is and remains far from us, practically inaccessible and unknowable; but in that case you have no further right to call God your Father; He may be a tyrant. In that case any attempt at a deeper religion remains a dream, perhaps the most beautiful of all dreams, yet a dream and a mere child of the brain. Everything hangs together in God's work.

But note well that if Protestantism chooses the other line of action, it will tend by this mere choice towards Catholicism. The germ of this return to unity is to be found in all that is most healthy and most Christian in the Christian sects. A return to Catholicism would be the most logical and most Christian evolution of Protestantism. The mind of man is "naturally christian"; among Christians it is equally naturally Catholic. Nothing truly Christian is to be suppressed; in fact, nothing will be suppressed except mutilations and deformities of Christ's message. Let Christian life intensify in the separated churches; let isolated Christian elements be allowed to tend to their real setting and normal growth — and Catholicism will be the outcome. That is why converts say that after taking the step they experience something more than the renewed interest of the convalescent going back to a familiar world. "That familiar world wears now not its former wintry look, but the garb of spring" (*The Month*, July, 1934). The reason is that by finding the one true Church of Christ, they have found themselves. The contradiction underlying their actual state has disappeared, and they find themselves at home in the one house and the one family which God has established in the human race and where every individual and every nation has its place prepared from all eternity.

The Church of Christ receives nothing or acquires nothing essential by the return of an individual or a group to the Faith. Yet, in secondary matters the Church can be perfected and is always busy perfecting herself. Made for the whole of humanity, Christianity takes its whole significance only by informing the whole of humanity. Every man and every nation realizes in a different way the human type. In the same way there are various ways of assimilating the Catholic type. Latins have realized it in a different way from Anglo-Saxons ; Germans in a different way from Indians ; the North American Catholic is different from the South American ; Africans have realized the Catholic type in various ways. The Spanish Catholic is quite different from the Japanese Catholic. The Church uses various languages, various liturgies, etc. And it has to be so. In this sense the Catholic Church will be perfectly Catholic only when the incorporation of all nations into the one Mystical Body of Christ will allow her to express all the divinizing potentialities of the Saviour. Yet, even this will mean only a secondary perfection to the Church of Christ, no real addition, for even now she is complete and fully Catholic in the essence of her being.

The Church wants to be all, not by suppressing what is good, but by giving the fullness of growth to what is dwarfed or incomplete. This is what differentiates her from all Christian sects. They are constituted by their limits ; she by the fullness of life with which she allows herself to be assimilated by the Man-God. The separated branches, which the withering storm of human selfishness or pride had separated from the trunk, clamour with all their might to be re-grafted on the stem.

In deep humility Catholics confess that in the 16th century their selfishness helped to rend the seamless garment of Unity. In deep humility we confess that even nowadays our personal want of charity is too often the great cause why our Protestant brethren do not notice all the love God has instilled in His Church.

In spite of all these human failures of us, her unworthy members, the Church remains a promise and a ferment of Unity. Catholicism is the "real formula that will effectively express our oneness". The spirit which dwells in her makes her anxious and thoughtful about the true unity of all Christians and of all men. We Catholics will really live her life when we are tormented by the same thoughtful care ; when we are more ready to pray and work and suffer for the advent in every human heart of the one Kingdom of Christ. *For humanity is made for Catholicism just as Catholicism is made for humanity.*

"Change and decay in all around I see

O ! Thou — who changest not — abide with me."

Religion is the whole of Man — Christianity is the whole of Religion — Catholicism is the whole of Christianity.

I FLED Him, down the night and down the
days ;

I fled Him, down the arches of the years ;

I fled Him, down the labyrinthine ways

Of my own mind ; and in the mist of tears

I hid from Him, and under running laughter.

Up vistaed hopes I sped ;

And shot, precipitated

Adown Titanic glooms of chasmed fears,

From those strong Feet that followed, followed
after.

But with unhurrying chase

And unperturbed pace,

Deliberate speed, majestic instancy,

They beat — and a Voice beat

More instant than the Feet —

‘ All things betray thee, who betrayest Me ! ’

FRANCIS THOMPSON

The Hound of Heaven

Homeward Bound

AN INTIMATE WORD TO MY PROTESTANT FRIENDS ON THE UNION OF CHRISTIANITY*

IF WE had a united Christianity at this moment, we would have a world-church 700 million strong, and in India alone that world-church would form one body nine million Christians.

There is no need to point out to sincere Christians that the actual situation is not according to Christ's will which was clearly "One Church, One Shepherd", "That they may be one".

The first condition to repair the disaster of the 16th century is fairness. To both Catholics and non-Catholics, the 16th century must always be a time of painful recollection from the religious point of view. We Catholics consider the split in Christianity at that time as a punishment of God for certain abuses which we do not deny nor wish to excuse. Some monasteries were too rich and worldly and had smirched their fair name of organizers and benefactors, of peasants and artisans, of havens of the poor and miserable. Some of the clergy, too, were unworthy of their exalted office. Too much wealth, called by Papini "*excrementa diaboli*", proved once again to be the worst curse that can befall the Church of Christ and the worst temptation for a strong priesthood.

* Statistics in this chapter are sadly out of date and due to after-war conditions it is impossible to bring them up to date.

If all the Catholics of that time had lived up to their faith, there could never have been question of Protestantism. Human nature being what it is we Catholics admit that a *true* Reformation was necessary (it followed), and that a true reformation and more adaptation will always remain necessary to individuals and societies if they wish to survive and progress.

On the other hand, the following has to be admitted: Had the monk of Wittenburg limited himself to a reform of religion and morals, to a revolt against abuses; had he not appealed at times to the lowest instinct of the German princes (Philip of Hesse, e.g.), trying to pull down the Church of 15 centuries' standing, he would be hailed to-day by the one great Church together with men like St. Ignatius of Loyola, St. Peter Canisius, St. Teresa of Avila, St. Francis of Sales, or St. Peter Claver who styled himself, and proved himself to be, the "slave of the slaves" in America.¹

If the English kings and queens, together with the new-rich ancestors of actual English Landlordism, had aimed only at greater sanctification and true reformation instead of making of their religious reform a bid for power and for looting monasteries in their own selfish interest, the world would have been spared many a painful episode and many an ugly feature.

But there is little use in tracing the disaster to right or left. The men who lived at that time have appeared long since before the tribunal of an all-Holy and all-Just God. And all those who lived at that time and for whom the battle was in real earnest a strict affair of conscience may have met long since in a better land and may have recognized each other as brothers.

Our problem is different and belongs to another period of history. Honesty and fairness are the first conditions to any understanding.

1. *A Saint in the Slave-Trade* by ARNOLD LUNN, Sheed & Ward, London.

I love my Protestant brethren very much and I wish I used my religion as many of them use theirs. But I should like to speak a frank word to them. It is this. That in Protestant circles there are a thousand times more wrong notions about Catholicism than there are among Catholics about Protestantism. I do not like to say this ; but I want to be frank.

Why have we still to hear those hundred-times refuted calumnies such as : Catholics adore the Virgin as a goddess ; they do not pray to God ; the old stories about Indulgences ; those ghastly stories about nuns and monks ; etc., etc.,... If one-tenth of all that is imputed to us were true, we should be the greatest idiots of world-history. Are those rusty weapons the only way of defending your principles and of spreading Christianity ? Both to Catholics and to Protestants it should be a point of honour, of truth and charity not to handle any weapon which is not stainless and shining.

The next step to unity is prayer for the union of all Christians in one Flock, under one Shepherd. Every Christian should join with his whole heart the yearly octave of prayer for this purpose. This octave of prayers was started by Rev. P. Watson when he himself was a Protestant, in 1907.

Next to prayer and honesty, study and action are required.

The World Conference on Faith and Order, (Lausanne, 1927) had realized this when it stated : "The divisions of Christendom may be a source of weakness in Christian countries, but in non-Christian lands they are a sin and a scandal."

And the Jerusalem Conference (1928) quoting these words adds :

"The type of Christianity accepted by converts has not been the outcome of any native tradition or conviction...but an accidental matter of geography ; corresponding conditions in England would be : all those who become Christians in Middlesex must be Anglican ; in Surrey, Wesleyan ; in Sussex, Congregational ; in Essex, Baptist ; etc., etc."

And in the recommendations of the International Missionary Council of Jerusalem, Holy Week, 1928, we read those sincere words: "The supreme hope of effective co-operation lies in Christ who is the source of all creative and enduring work. The resources of God are at our disposal and the limitless power of God can be made available for the great unfinished task, but there is nothing in the New Testament to show that those resources are ever cheaply available. There is a price to be paid" (*Syllabus of Lectures*, p. 38).

THERE IS A PRICE TO BE PAID!

What is that price? It cannot be the price of the Christian Faith itself in favour of a vague formula of artificial unification. The "One Flock and One Shepherd" can never be promoted, much less effected, by a federation where additions, subtractions, multiplications tamper with the deposit of faith. With St. Paul all Christians must desire no less than the 100% Christianity:

"But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema" (GAL. i, 8).

Compromise may or may not be right in politics but in points of Christ's revealed religion, it is a crime.

"The Protestant Church must find some substitute for Rome" writes Professor Latourette of Yale University in the *Protestant International Review of Missions*, Jan. 28. But why find a problematic substitute when the reality is within easy reach? Who is more logical, even humanly speaking, Latourette or Newman, the founder of the Oxford Movement and the author of *Lead, Kindly Light*? Newman thought that conversion to the old Catholic Faith was the price

to be paid. And he paid it and he is not alone. In fact, the long road home is crowded with tens of thousands of convert pilgrims returning from the far country of Protestantism to the Mother Church of the Ages. A few examples :

IN ENGLAND

Outstanding among the English converts was Henry Edward Manning, who became Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster and Primate of England ; Robert Hugh Benson, writer and historian, whose father was Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury ; the Marquis of Bute, and five years later, in 1874, the eminent Liberal statesman Lord Ripon, ² who was to be the most beloved of Indian Viceroy.

Most striking of all is the drift of English intellectuals to the Catholic Church in our own days. An average of 12,000 converts enter the Church every year. Among them we find such great names as C. C. Martindale who revived the tradition of intellectual brilliance, established by Newman by taking the

2. Sir Surendranath Banerjea, in *A Nation in the Making*, writes of him on p. 64. " We in India knew little or nothing about Lord Ripon or his antecedents. There were two circumstances that were in his favour. He was the nominee of Gladstone who had thoroughly identified himself with the popular view in India regarding the Vernacular Press Act, and he was a convert to Roman Catholicism and had suffered for his faith. We remembered what the *Times* wrote of him when, giving up his great position in the social and public life of England, he deliberately faced the prospect of ruin by embracing the Roman Catholic Faith. I was in England at the time and I remember the great stir it caused. . . . The *Times* had a leading article in which it prophesied that Lord Ripon was a lost man. But in those days educated India, following the dictum of Cobden, approved what the *Times* disapproved, and we welcomed Lord Ripon as a ruler who had suffered for the Faith that was in him. Events showed that we were fully justified."

first prize in practically every course he followed at Oxford.

Ronald Knox, the son of an Anglican Bishop, one of the ablest satirists in England, renouncing the parental heritage to join Catholicism.

Dr. William C. Orchard, one of the most eloquent voices in the pulpits of England. In his *From Faith to Faith* he tells of his spiritual pilgrimage which ended in Rome.

Rev. Dr. Vernon Johnson, an Anglican scholar of note.

Other illustrious names are : Gerald Manley Hopkins, the poet ; Maurice Baring ; Alfred Noyes, at one time poet laureate of England ; Evelyn Waugh ; Enid Dennis ; Sheila Kaye-Smith, the popular novelist ; Shane Leslie ; Compton MacKenzie ; D. B. Wyndham Lewis ; Cecil Chesterton ; G. K. Chesterton ; Owen Francis Dudley.

The British Official *Catholic Directory* for 1934 states that the number of converts received into the Church the previous year was 12,288, or 126 more than the year before. Among notable people received in that year were : Arnold Lunn, son of Sir Henry Lunn, a distinguished author ; the Rev. W. H. Thomas, formerly Anglican Vicar of St. Agnes', Cardiff ; Mrs. Helen Colt, a horticulturist of international repute ; Archbishop Vladimir Alexandroff, of the Russian Orthodox Church of the United States ; M. Hirouki Kawai, Japanese Ambassador to Poland (in Warsaw) ; the Rev. William Force Stead, M.A., Fellow and Chaplain of Worcester College, Oxford ; Miss Bidwell, daughter of the Anglican Bishop Bidwell, (formerly Anglican Bishop of Ontario) ; the Hon. Catherine Beryl Gallagher, sister of Lord Inchiquin ; Mr. John Adriance, Professor of Science in Detroit University (received by the Bishop of Menevia) ; the Rev. Harold Cheesman, formerly Anglican Vicar of Collaton, Paignton ; Vice-Admiral Robert Hornell, R.N., D.S.O. ; the Rev. Thomas Whitton, M.A., an Anglican clergyman for many years.

But the most brilliant converts of our days in England were without doubt Arnold Lunn and G. K.

Chesterton. Both were led to take the step by logical reasoning and objective evidence. Emotion played little, if any, rôle in either case. Both were gifted litterateurs with a wide knowledge of history and culture. The former is justly famous for his book (among a dozen others) *The Flight from Reason*, in which he contrasts the Thomistic insistence upon reason and objective evidence with the subjectivism and credulity prevalent to-day. Both had been at one time critics of the Catholic Church; both passed through the stages of Agnosticism, and the half-way station of Anglicanism in the quest for religious truth which terminated at Rome. The great thinker and brilliant writer of paradox, G.K. Chesterton, was received in 1922. His conversion shook England like a mighty bomb.

In continental Europe, too, there are many converts among the *litterati*. I have no statistics at hand. Suffice it to mention, conversions like those of Sigrid Undset, winner of the Nobel Prize for literature in 1921; Johannes Jørgensen; Dr. Marchant, Minister of Education of Holland, received into the Church in 1934.

IN AMERICA

An article entitled, "Giant Intellects are Romeward Bound — Our Modern Converts", in the Catholic weekly, *Our Sunday Visitor*, by the Rev. Edward Dailey, of Our Lady of Mercy Church, Chicago, reviewed the ever-increasing number of conversions from Protestantism to the Catholic faith in the United States and Europe. It has been estimated, the article states, that out of 3,000 American converts there were 372 Protestant clergymen, 135 of whom became priests; 115, according to the survey, were doctors, 126 lawyers, 45 members or former members of Congress, 12 governors or former governors of States, 180 Army and Navy officers,

and 206 authors, musicians, and persons of cultural prominence.

"One of the first to cut himself off from Puritan tradition in America was Orestes Brownson. He was an eclectic in Theology, if ever there was one. Although born of Congregational parents, he became a Universal minister, but soon lost faith in revelation and the divinity of Christ. Passing through Presbyterianism, Unitarianism, and Congregationalism, he ultimately, at the age of 41 fought his way into the Catholic Church.

"James Kent Stone, President of Kenyon and Hobart Colleges, followed Brownson into the Church, a further surprise for New England. He was a man of letters, well thought of and extraordinarily tranquil in his religious convictions.

"At the turning of the century, the movement towards the Church became startling; proceeding in an irresistible march up to our own time there was a tidal wave of conversions. It no longer was a shock; it became as a weekly expectation.

"Names such as John Stoddart, author of *Rebuilding a Lost Faith*; the honourable Bellamy Storer; George Searle; Dr. Kinsman, one time Episcopal Bishop of Delaware; Peter Burnett, the eminent jurist; Professor Lord of Harvard University; Dr. Dwight, also of Harvard; Dr. Alfred Doolittle, the astronomer; Rear-Admiral Benson, John Tabb and Joyce Kilmer, the poets; James S. Hill, famous railroad builder; Dr. John Cutter; Countess Mackin; F. Marion Crawford and Frank Spearman, the novelists; the inimitable Artemus Ward; Isaac Hecker, founder of the Paulist Order in America; Carlton J. H. Hayes, Professor of History at Columbia and a noted writer; Henry Brownson; the Archbishops Samuel Eccleston of Baltimore, Bayley of Newark and Baltimore, Blenk of New-Orleans, Christie of Oregon, Wood of Philadelphia; the Bishops Whaddams of Ogdenberg, Rosecrans of Columbus, Young of Erie, Gilmour of Cleveland, Curtis of Wilmington, Baecker of Savannah, Tyler

of Hartford, — array a brilliant galaxy of prominent men and women who swell the ranks of our converts.

"Thousands of others have joined this movement within the last four years, such as the prominent New York Minister Dr. Selden Delany, who was ordained at Rome and has only just lately passed away in America, and Horace Mann, prominent Washington D.C. attorney and descendant of the gentleman of the same name who is honoured as the father of the famous American public school system."

It is well known that Catholics in the United States alone number 24,000,000.

We take the following from an interview granted to an N.C.W.C. correspondent by the newly ordained Fr. Delany of New York, who was an Anglican clergyman for thirty years before his conversion in 1930: "I had always been a High-Churchman and I looked forward to the gradual Catholicizing within the Anglican Church and union with the Papacy. But I came to feel at last that the Anglo-Catholic movement is a losing cause within the Episcopal Church. Rather there is a trend to more Protestantism and in a liberal direction, while on the other hand the Catholic Church is standing as always for the Catholic Faith, and for distinctly Christian moral standards. In Protestantism those standards are being lowered to suit the demands of the world."

I venture to finish this list with a few Christian converts to Catholicism in India.

(1) Dr. H. C. F. Zacharias — One time editor of *The Guardian*, Madras, founder of the Catholic national weekly in Bombay *The Week*, author of *Renascent India*. The gripping story of his conversion is told by himself in *Dominus Illuminatio Mea*. Light of the East Series.

(2) J. Stephen Narayan, B. D., same series.

(3) J. B. Ghosal, M.A. — He told his long but beautiful fight for Truth in *My Home-coming*, via *the West and the East*. Indian Catholic Truth Society, Trichinopoly Cantonment.

(4) Mar Ivanios and Mar Theophilos — who both, staked everything, wealth, career, etc., in order to join the great Church. Bishop Theophilos exults in the Catholic world-brotherhood. The fraternal welcome extended to him as a prelate of the great world-wide family of Catholics is the most precious souvenir of his ten months' tour in Europe, as His Lordship himself declared on his return to India.

"I am happy to record that my greatest consolation as I passed through Europe", said Mar Theophilos, "was to experience the sympathy and kindness of the faithful and of the priests, bishops, archbishops, and cardinals, who received me, a stranger from India, as a brother. After living so long the isolated life of those who are separated by disunion, I thank God for His goodness in opening the way for me into the world-wide Church of Christ. How reasonable the idea seems! How unreasonable is any other conception of the manner in which God would expect mankind to worship Him!

"I bring back tender memories of the beautiful demonstration of the living Faith which I found at the great shrines of Europe: Lourdes, Lisieux, Paray-le-Monial, Einsiedeln, Assisi, Padua and Loretto. It still fills me with emotion to recall my visit to the Holy Father, who received me four times and showed me such deep affection.

"I return to Malabar to continue the modest pioneer life with my brave flock. As we pray in the simple sheds which serve us as temporary chapels I shall see in my mind's eye this great outside world in union with us, and it will give inspiration to me and to my people.

"All thanks to the legion of good folk who were kind to me. God be praised for His goodness in granting me this ineffable privilege of oneness with the See of Peter."

I should give many more names such as those of Mr. George Joseph, former secretary of Mr. Gandhi; Mr. Gilani, editor of *The Social Order*, suppressed by Government.

Protestants in India have less excuse than their brethren, say in England, for checking the natural trek towards the centre of unity, Rome. Yet, here is a manifesto signed by an immense group of 940 Anglican clergymen, which proves at least this much that strenuous efforts are being made in England for union with Rome. The manifesto follows :

“(1) We must not allow local controversies and jealousies to obscure this salient fact, that Rome has been the Centre of Christendom ever since St. Peter set up his throne therein. Two Lambeth Conferences have asserted that we cannot think of reunion of Christendom without Rome. Nor can a Catholic Christian contemplate any other issue.

“(2) We must not blind ourselves to the plain fact, that Rome will not and cannot depart from her ‘*De Fide*’ definitions. Policy, discipline, non-essentials of any kind, may be changed, *but never matters of faith and morals*. We therefore re-assert the following statements as axiomatic and fundamental: (a) the conversion of the world depends on the visible unity of the Church of God, for Our Lord prayed ‘that they all may be one...that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.’ (JOHN xvii, 21) ; (b) He provided the means for the maintenance of this unity by the appointment of a *visible head* of the *visible body*: ‘Thou art Peter and upon this rock, I will build my Church’ (MATT. xvi, 18). History has shown what interpretation the Church has given to this text, for none other has been the Church’s acknowledged head upon earth *save he who sits on Peter’s throne*. Separation from this centre of unity has always led the separated into further schisms, while the acknowledgement of it must necessarily lead to the healing of divisions ; (c) the fact must be faced, that the two points we have set down are first principles with Rome, and it will be useless to attempt negotiations with her, in regard to union, except on that understanding. The first of these premises must be accepted by all who accept the Gospel of St. John as an inspired writing. The second is

accepted by the third and fourth General Councils — those of Ephesus and Chalcedon — to which the Church of England is thoroughly committed.” — Quoted in the *Rays of Light*, I.C.T.S., Trichinopoly, August, 1935.

INSPECTING THE CATHOLIC WORLD-FORCE

More than once I have met well-read people in India who believed Catholics a small minority among Christians, doomed to extinction in the near future. The reason for this baffling ignorance I believe to be the fact that the British news-agencies are mostly in the hands of men unable to give a fair idea of the religious currents in the world.

Presently we shall survey the Catholic population of the world. We know very well that numbers alone are no test of Truth ; still, for all those who sympathize with Catholicism it cannot but be a cause for optimism that the greatest champion of objective truth, morality and unity in the modern world, counts also the largest number of adherents.

According to world-statistics the number of men on earth in 1932, was found to be over two billions. What is the number of Catholics in the world at present ? — 375 millions ! The number of all other Christians (Protestant and Schismatic) is 329 millions ; of Moslems 260 millions ; and the remainder 1,072 millions. In other words, one-fifth (18·3 per cent) of our contemporaries are Catholics, and altogether more than one-third (34·3 per cent) are Christians. Moslems come in for 12·6 per cent ; Buddhists for 10·4 per cent ; Hindus and Animists in India for 12·5 per cent ; and Confucianists for 17·4 per cent. It should be noted, however, that from the religious

point of view, the words Hindu, Buddhist, Confucianist are generic names which do not mean necessarily unity in a common religion.

In fact, those names are still more heterogeneous than the word Protestant which applies to 400 different sects.

The 375 million Catholics are distributed by continents as follows :

Europe	210 millions
America	136 "
Africa	8 "
Asia with Philippine Islands	19 "
Oceania	2 "

More than half of America (namely 53 per cent) and two-fifths of Europe (or 41 per cent) are Catholic. One-seventh (15·4 per cent) of America and one-fourth (24·9 per cent) of Europe are Protestant. The rest are mostly indifferent to religion. Of these last there are 30 millions in Europe and 72 millions in North America.

Thus almost one in every five men is Catholic ; also more than one-third of mankind (34·3 per cent) is Christian.

All these numbers given are from official or at least reliable statements obtained by careful study of every country separately. Readers interested in the matter will find it all in *Les Religions du Monde*, by Abbé A. D'Espierres, 1935, 2nd edition, 36 pp., Union Missionnaire du Clergé, 40, Rue du Méridien, Bruxelles (3).

My Indian friends may say that at least in India Catholicism is still a small minority.

True, the number is relatively small but it is by no means the final index of the influence of Catholicism in India. At present I only wish to point out that Catholics are found not only among the poor and illiterate people, though we are proud to work among them and to count them among our Catholic brethren.

Mr. C. J. Varkey, M.A., Secretary of the former All-India Catholic League, published an incomplete list of the following departments in which Catholics were engaged :

1581 enterprises were conducted by Catholics. Of these 151 were Banking and Insurance Companies : there were 35 banks owned by Catholics, 60 co-operative societies, 24 insurance companies, 12 provident funds.

Under Catholic Action organizations Mr. Varkey brought together a list of 681 bodies. Many of these are sodalities and associations linked with general parish life but certain of the classifications are of special interest. There were, for example, 48 St. Vincent de Paul societies, 27 Social Service clubs, 83 libraries and reading-rooms, 40 societies maintaining book-stalls, 27 clubs and study-clubs, 40 students' organizations, 18 Catholic teachers' associations.

A small but impressive section of Mr. Varkey's book gives the names of 58 Catholics of India who have been honoured by distinctions from the Holy Father, while 90 Catholics have received distinctions from the State. Seven Catholics, then, have been honoured by both Church and State.

So far we have surveyed the Catholic force in its material aspect in India. To have a complete idea of Catholic strength in the world we should have to cast a glance on every country, on the records of the Church's educational, charitable, social, and especially religious and moral services, a task far beyond the scope of this book.

If anyone wishes to have an idea of the immense possibilities of the Catholic Church in India, I refer him to the *Catholic Directory*, Good Pastor Press, Broadway, Madras. There he will find the description, at least in fair outlines, of a picked hierarchy, both Indian and European, a highly trained priesthood, a blossoming of devoted sisterhoods, the respective training centres for Catholic priests and nuns, the numerous Catholic Art colleges, with their preparatory schools, the various centres of social service in rural India, and the Church's unselfish devotion to the poor, the aged, the blind, the deaf and dumb, the lepers, etc., etc. ; also a glorious list of

Catholic newspapers and periodicals, both in English and in the Vernaculars.

But it is high time we turn to the second part of this book. The reader has a right to know more about the spirit of the Church, about her mission in the India of the future. In fact, the Church is always more concerned about the future than about all her past records and achievements.

Part II

**Rebuilding
A Nation**

WHAT thou hast inherited
from thy father, earn it anew
if thou wouldst possess it.

GOETHE

Catholicism & Culture

CATHOLICISM IS not only the Religion of Humanity (BERGSON). It is also the religion of perfect humanism. It is supra-national, supra-cultural.

For cultures, new and old, Catholicism carries within itself the dynamic principle of true renaissance.

Civilization is not the result of an iron process of evolution, blindly pledged to cultural decline.

Catholic humanism and free will can remould and revive cultures in spite of environment.

Catholicism guards the transcendent and immanent principle of Life and Resurrection: "It seeks not the destruction or negation of nature but its spiritualization and its incorporation in a higher order of things."¹

One of the greatest heresies against Catholicism is the heresy of extreme spiritualism which ever anew tries to make out that Catholicism is the Church of souls only.

Sound psychology is at one with sound philosophy. Souls separated from their bodies do not exist in this world. The real beings we meet with are concrete, historical, and no Plato or Descartes, in East or West, will ever succeed in putting a wall between spirit and matter in man. True philosophy teaches that body and soul do not live together as mere juxtaposed neighbours, one next to the other; they are the essential components of what makes a *man*. Thomist philo-

1. DAWSON in *Progress and Religion*.

sophy holds that even after death the separated soul keeps an essential relation to the body.

In theology, also, the attitude which is purely spiritual is unjustifiable. God is not interested only in *souls*, but in *men* composed of bodies and souls. He is the Creator and Redeemer of the real humanity, and His church was to be not merely a society of believing souls, but the immense home of the human race, with all its miseries, with all its physical, moral and intellectual splendours. To say that the aim of the Church is the salvation of souls is not an incorrect, but it is an incomplete, statement. Some people, unhappily even some Catholics, think that the real effective work of the Church begins only after death, and that all the rest of human life is only preparation for that moment. If we lived according to their ideas, we would live in this world only as travellers in a railway station, without being allowed to take interest in the soil where we are born, or where we are pledged to spend our lives. Only the house of prayer would be of interest where the Redeemer of men would be treated as a distinguished guest without any relation to the outside world. All the rest would leave us cold ! Industry with its factories and transport lines would leave us cold ! Art with its museums and masterpieces scattered throughout the East and West : the Parthenon of Ictinus, the songs of Homer, the Taj Mahal, the frescoes of Ajanta and of Michelangelo, the old Indian epics, all that would leave us cold ! The slums of modern cities would awaken no echo in my heart and in my life !

Such an attitude is evidently not the Catholic attitude. If it is true that the world has but one meaning, all this giant effort of humanity in its most varied forms must find a place in that one universal meaning. As we have seen, the clue to the meaning of the universe is Catholicism. And the Catholic tradition in St. Paul, St. Irenæus, the school of Alexandria, Origen, the three Cappadocians, Dydimus, etc., has always found a place and a great meaning for all the gestures of suffering, struggling, or victorious humanity.

What is the theological foundation of the interest of Catholicism in the most human and cultural activities of man?

The first man, before the Fall, was not subject to those physical laws which oppress us. He did not know suffering, decay or death, in man. He realized in himself St. Augustine's definition of perfect liberty: to will what we are able to do, and to be able to do what we will: "*velle quod possumus, posse quod volumus*".

We are the descendants and the heirs of that first humanity; but between that humanity and ourselves there looms the world-disaster of Original Sin. Deprived of his prerogatives, reduced to his normal place, man finds himself without any experience in a world to whose laws he is subjected. Man has to seek his food, to defend himself, to struggle with disease and death, to fight constantly against decay in his physical and mental powers.

But man was not left alone. By the grace of the Redeemer who was to come or who had come, God wished to lead man again to the high state from which he had fallen, and to make him tread, one by one, the steps of progress up to the resurrection and new glorification of our bodies. And the permanent leaven of this process in humanity is Christ continued in His Church and working in humanity in the most varied ways. His Church is not only a society for souls and its sphere of action is not limited to eternal salvation after death. The whole activity of humanity is its sphere of action. All that tends to restore to man the lost prerogatives of original humanity. All that increases his power, all that makes him more conscious, all that makes him master of the natural forces, all that increases man's sovereignty over the world. All this has a new meaning in Christ, even if men are not conscious of it, or abuse this increased power for selfish ends. As a Catholic I recognize in all this: *Redemption at work*. The whole of past history, the age-long effort of humanity has only one supreme meaning:

the meaning which Christ gave to it. Hence the Church is not only concerned with souls and heaven; it is also concerned with men and the world. We cannot isolate the action of Christ within the four walls of our Churches. He, who was so interested in the birds of the air, in the lilies of the field and in the broom of the poor woman, would laugh at us if we were to wish to segregate Him from the world. I am interested in the world not as a hunter who is interested in game (the game would gladly do without this kind of interest), not as the police who are ready to supply free food and lodging, not as the *mahajan* who is unfailing in his maternal interest in his creditors; neither am I interested in the world only to make conversions though I try to make conversions. As a Catholic, priest or layman, I have to be interested in every human problem far or near, because I know for certain that Redemption is at work in it, whether men notice it or not; and when I try to fight disease, or help the poor, and strengthen the feeble, physically, morally or intellectually, I know that I am co-operating in the work of Redemption by repairing the disastrous consequences of the Fall.

Hence it is clear that no Catholic can be opposed to anything valuable or great in human cultures. Pius V condemned the proposition that there is a real antagonism between nature and grace. The man has not to be destroyed in order to make room for the Christian. Human cultures have not to be despoiled of any valuable element in order to give room to Christianity. The latest papal encyclicals on this point are not new. "Propaganda" ² in 1659 was as emphatic as are the three last Popes. And from the beginning, the attitude of the Church towards the various human cultures she met on her way has always been one of veneration and service. This has been and is the only *de jure* attitude of Catholicism and is as old as Catholicism itself. St. Paul, Jew as he was, appealed to the central authority of Christianity

2. "Propaganda" is a committee in Rome which takes care of the Catholic Missions of the world.

in order to make it clear once for all against the old die-hards that in order to become a Christian it was not necessary to adopt Jewish culture. The great Christian thinkers of the early centuries stress the same thought. St. Clement of Alexandria was a scholar in Greek thought and Greek literature and presented the unchangeable message of Christ in Greek terms and Greek terminology. Confronted with the cultures of Greece and Rome, the Church spoke, thought, built and sang in Greek and Roman terms. Confronted with the culture of Irish bards and druids, the Church followed the same line of action ; so much so that up to this day, in spite of centuries of persecution, St. Patrick is considered not only as the father in the faith, but also as the preserver and sanctifier of the time-honoured Irish traditions. The same respect was shown to the culture of the Alemanni, the Nordic tribes of South Germany and Switzerland ; St. Boniface among the Germans and St. Augustine in England followed the same policy, the latter being given detailed instructions by Pope Gregory the Great who sent him. But the Church did not only assist passively at the building up of cultures. She was the vivifying sun which gave a new lease of life to old values, transfiguring them in a blaze of new light and putting them as a crown, set with jewels of the soil, on the virgin heads of the rising nations. It was the "Great Church" (Catholicism) which, as early as the second and third centuries, founded those famous cultural centres of Alexandria, Antioch, Edessa, where flourished a galaxy of thinkers and scholars whose influence is felt in the world of Church and State even up to the present day ; such were Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, John Chrysostom, Ephrem, Ambrose, Jerome.

In the dark ages it was the monasteries that treasured with infinite care the values of a dying and decaying culture. In the real Middle Ages, the Church called from the soil as by magic those gorgeous Gothic cathedrals, veritable prayers in stone. It was the

Church's spirit which built up a rural Europe and a guild system that proved itself the pride of Europe. It was the Middle Ages which prepared the real renaissance. The Roman pontiffs themselves by papal decree founded no less than 29 universities, and in conjunction with the civil ruler no less than 10 more universities. Oxford, Cambridge, Paris, Bologna, Toulouse, Rome, Padua, Pisa, Florence, Prague, Cologne, Heidelberg, Leipzig, Louvain, Cracow and Vilna are creations of Catholicism.

Printing, the greatest invention for the cultural progress of mankind, was a Catholic invention, being first devised by a Catholic goldsmith, John Gutenberg, in the Catholic city of Strasburg, and first practised in the Catholic city of Mayence, in Germany, in 1445. It was the Catholic clergy, and especially the Benedictine monasteries, which financed and spread the new art all over Europe. The first press in England was set up in a Benedictine monastery in London. Prior to 1501, books were printed in 272 places. During the period from 1501 to 1520, printing was introduced in 93 new places; so that prior to 1521 books were being printed at no less than 365 places. From 1445 to 1520 more than 2,424 printing-offices had been established, operating more than 7,269 presses and employing more than 10,819 workers.

John Gutenberg printed the first forty-two line Bible. The first six editions of the Hebrew Bible were printed at Bologna and Naples; the first Greek text was issued at Milan in 1481. The first text of the complete Bible in the original language was printed by Cardinal Ximenes in 1502 from manuscripts supplied by Pope Gregory XIII. About 1510 the first printed *Gazettes* began to appear at Venice. That was 150 years before the date of the first English newspaper. Some one may say that printing is an *old* invention. I ask: "Is the great Catholic scientist Marconi the inventor of an old contrivance?"

It is impossible to give even a bare outline of the contribution of Catholic laymen and priests to science: among the mathematicians, the astronomers, chemists, ethnologists, biologists, medical men, etc. To give but

one example, take the case of physicists : We speak of galvanism, of a galvanic battery, of galvanized iron. Electricity has brought us a number of measures, the units of various kinds used in the measurement of that mysterious entity which we call the electric current. There are 5 of those units : the Volt, the Ampère, the Coulomb, the Ohm, and the Farad. Each of these terms is the whole or part of a man's name connected with this science, because he was the first or the greatest discoverer in that line. Now, of the six most prominent names connected with this subject — viz. Galvani, Volta, Ampère, Coulomb, Ohm, Michael Faraday, — four were surely fervent Catholics ; Ohm, teaching in a Jesuit college, was probably a Catholic, Michael Faraday was not a Catholic. Hence, four out of six names embedded in the nomenclature of this science are certainly Catholic. Anyone who wishes for more information about Catholicism and science is referred to *The Church and Science*,³ by Sir Bertram C. A. Windle, M.A., M.D., Sc.D., LL D., Ph.D., F.R.S., K.S.G. ; or to smaller works of the C T S. pamphlets, London, Dublin, New York, Trichinopoly, etc. This is not the place to develop the topic. So great has been the part of the Church in all that is best in Europe, that Christianity is often called a Western religion. And yet Catholicism has never been monopolized by a state, a nation, an empire or a continent. Christ does not exist for the West but rather Western Europe exists for Him.

As Karl Adam puts it in *Christ and the Western Mind*: "Europe stands in relation to Christ not because it needs Him but because He gives the order, because He stands before it as a Command. This relation depends in no wise on the approval or good will of the West, but is imposed before any personal decision by Christ Himself. Imposed in mercy certainly, — nevertheless imposed ; imposed as early as that white night when the Logos descended upon earth and the light shone from Bethlehem."

3. Obtainable from the Catholic Truth Society, London, or Herder, St. Louis, Mo., U.S.A.

True it is that Christ has left a deep mark on Europe, so deep that modern Europe, with all its atheism, selfishness and sin, finds it hard to rub out from its soul the lines of Christ's figure. How to explain Christ's influence in the West? One day Christ called on the genius of the tribes and nations of Europe, and those tribes and nations answered His call. They followed Him. They formulated His message in their philosophical terms, in their art, in their literature. But they soon found out that by serving Him they served their higher selves, personally and culturally. It was in Christ that those Latin, Celtic, Anglo-Saxon, Slav races found their true unity. This bond was more subtle than all possible ties of blood, stronger and more lasting than any unity imposed by a common fate: it was the unity of the same faith and the same worship. Christ became the Heart of the West, and as far and as long as Europe was faithful to Christ, He remained the guarantee of their culture. And even now all that is still great, noble or beautiful in modern Europe bears the traces and the seal of Him who one day spoke to her the tremendous words: "Follow Me." I do not wish to pass over the ugly features of ancient, and especially modern, Europe: War lust, Gold lust, Imperialism. If these features exist, they are due, not to, but in spite of, Christ and His Religion. They are traceable to the facts:

1. that Europeans, like all men, belong to a fallen race in which original sin has left deep marks;
2. that individuals or groups of Europeans freely divorced themselves from the espousals of Christ;
3. to the fact that Europe, like any other continent and civilization, has to face the crisis brought about by modern inventions which may lead to heights of good or evil unknown before in the history of mankind. Man remains free to choose.

A great historian, Taine, who had long been one of the standard-bearers of the materialistic interpretation of history, wrote at a later stage of his life: "Always and everywhere, for the past eighteen hundred years, as soon as the influence of Christianity decayed

or failed, public and private morality were thrown to the winds. In Italy during the Renaissance ; in England under the Restoration ; in France during the Revolution ; man turned pagan as in the first century, and found himself just as he was under Augustus and Tiberius : cruel and voluptuous. He abused and reviled others and himself ; cruelty and sensuality prevailed, and society was only fit for cut-throats and debauchees."

As a European, who deeply loves his country, I confess I feel sorry and ashamed of the evident wrongs that Europe has added to its records the last few years. Totalitarianism, concentration camps in Germany and Russia, indiscriminate bombings and the last but not the least, the Atom Bomb. All these horrors fill my heart with shame, and yet I hold that all these sins of official Europe have not destroyed the heart of Europe yet. Only those who pass through Europe in a sleeping-car or are led by the nose by interested parties or are lacking in broad-minded vision of the world, only those will find nothing lovable in my home : Europe. No news-black-out and no brute force can check the resurrection of Europe.

The shallow authors of *Mother India* and *Verdict on India* had no business to constitute themselves ' drain inspectors ' and give their picture of India to the world.

In the same way people of different cultures have no right to throw mud at each other. As long as we have not entered and intimately contacted the family circles of a foreign nation, so long can we hardly claim an intimate knowledge of that country.

" On ne peut plus hair ce qu' on a connu vraiment."

Non-Europeans, who have entered from the noisy street into the peaceful atmosphere of the best of European families,⁴ who have glimpsed at the obscure and unself-

4. A few addresses for travelling Indian students in Europe, who wish to come in touch with Catholic University students :

(i) " Ligue missionnaire des Etudian's de France — 5, rue Monsieur, Paris. (ii) A.U.C.A.M. — 82, rue de Paris, Louvain. (iii) Association pour l'Union fraternelle entre les Races — 18-20, rue de Toul, Lille.

ish devotion to the poor and miserable of many social *élites*, who have witnessed in the cultured and religious *havens of the churches*, the organized social services for men or women, do not hide having been much impressed. "I must not hesitate to acknowledge where Europe is great," writes Rabindranath in *Nationalism*, "for great she is without doubt. We cannot help loving her with all our heart and paying her the best tribute of our admiration." They have seen with their own eyes the seal of Christ. The influence of Christ has been and is still the greatest force for good in Europe, the only hope for its resurrection. One thing, however, we should remember that Catholicism is not a European religion. It does not stand or fall, rise or decay with Europe, rather it is Europe that stands or falls with the rise or decay of its Catholic Faith. Catholicism is not and has never been the religion of a group, a nation or an empire. By right, Catholicism is the *religion* of redeemed humanity, of the whole of humanity till the end of time.

CATHOLICISM AND INDIA'S CULTURE TO BE

I dare say that as a rule men do not reject Christ and His Religion because, knowing and understanding its nature, they refuse out of sheer wickedness to obey; but they reject it because they think that by embracing Christianity they would have to sacrifice all that is best in them culturally and socially. In saying this, I do not mean to deny that there is such a thing in the world as a sin against the Light through perversity or cowardice, nor do I forget that Christ preached the Cross. But I say that for a certain percentage of sincere young men the fear of losing cultural values is the only obstacle to their embracing Christianity with the whole strength of their noble soul. Unhappily

certain Christians, or even priests, have at times given occasion to this error. But thank God, Christianity does not rise or fall with them.

Catholicism has not come to India as a culture which tries to supplant India's culture. Catholicism is first of all the God-revealed Religion of Truth and Salvation. The heart of India cannot object to Him to whom all men are, in the very nature of their being, subject, and who moreover has redeemed us afresh by His blood. Conversion to Catholicism does not mean the strategic reinforcement of a party; it means the return of a soul to God in order to serve Him as He wishes to be served.

Catholicism is interested not only in Indian souls, but in the whole Indian, and in the whole of India's problems. Catholicism is interested in Indian thought, art, culture, not in order to destroy or suppress, but in order *to serve* and *to fulfil*. The history of individuals and nations shows that by serving Christ, far from losing anything valuable, they serve their highest selves in a way undreamt of. Christ is never outdone in generosity.

As early as Europe, India was called on to put its great culture at the service of Christ. It is not proved so far that St. Thomas, one of the twelve Apostles, came to India, though historical tradition gives this view a high probability. It is sure, however, that in the third century the seed of Christianity had fallen and taken root in Malabar. But for the wedge of Mohammedan conquests driven between East and West, India might be a Catholic nation now. Even so, in spite of the wedge, there was a time when Akbar and several other members of the imperial court were seriously contemplating the momentous step of following the Christ.⁵

I have no doubt that a Catholic India would have been the brightest pearl in the crown of Christ the King. Neither have I any doubt that Catholicism, with its message of a human personality distinct from God, free will, the essential goodness of matter, God's mercy, etc., would have made for a greater India than the one

we know, and by the very fact, for a better world. However that may be, Christ calls again on India. He never ceased to call. He is able to and He is desirous to save Indians, not only for eternity but also to save them in time. Christ is the only Ideal great enough, historical enough, universal enough to be enshrined in the culture of India. Catholicism is not opposed to Indian culture ; it is ready to serve, ready to throw its tremendous forces and its long experience into the great task of building up a great Indian culture. Catholicism does not believe in cheap popularity. That is why it works steadily and builds on rock.

With the best national leaders it dreams of a rejuvenated Indian art, a music to entrance the world, an all-India literature built on the finest traditions of the past ; Indian thought synthetized in a great system, solid like a Himalayan range, built for a world mission, carrying high the eternal message of the unchangeable Christ. If Christ be taken as the corner-stone of the building, India is bound to rise like a mighty lighthouse for the world ; a lighthouse built in Indian style and with the Indian cultural material ; a beacon whence shines forth India's Ideal — Christ. A Catholic India would not mean an India outside the line of its normal evolution ; it would be the completion of a process which has been going on for centuries. All that is best in India has been gravitating towards Catholicism as the solar system gravitates towards a point near the constellation of Hercules. It would be interesting to show this gravitation towards Christ in the whole of Indian history. (That volume remains to be written, and we will understand it only in heaven.) Since the Fall no supernatural grace has ever been granted except through Christ. No supernatural salvation has ever been possible except through Him. All the men that were saved were saved through Jesus Christ. Catholicism is not responsible for the horrible doctrine that all non-Christians go to hell. Some separate sects, seizing upon a few fragments of Christ's teaching, have misinterpreted His doctrine of love into a hopeless doctrine

of heartlessness. On the contrary, Catholicism holds that to any man of goodwill, God offers at some time or other what is necessary to lead his soul into the abode of supreme divine bliss. God wants all men to be saved. Christ died for all. All souls have been redeemed and no one is doomed for sins of a previous life which he cannot remember. If a man is doomed to hell, it is because he has made of himself, and not of God, the centre of his worship, and died in that ugly state.

All the *rishis* of ancient India that were saved were saved because in all sincerity they did not know Christ explicitly ; yet they fully co-operated with His grace and light, which is refused to no one by the God who wishes all men to be saved. They were saved through an act of perfect love and hence through a perfect sorrow for sins. They were saved because they had the implicit or explicit desire of using the God-appointed means of salvation, and God, in His goodness, taking the desire for the deed, granted them the everlasting vision of Himself, face to face. But if those noblest *rishis* of India, now glorified in heaven, were to be reincarnated, what would their message be ? They would cross and recross the country and cry out unceasingly : " Bharat, Bharat, we have stared ourselves blind by gazing at Truth, and it was Christ we were looking for but unhappily we did not know ; we have crippled ourselves, and it was He we were reaching after ; at the gates of India's shrines we have squatted, arms dried up pointing to heaven, and it was He, the Christ, we were pointing to. The best systems of thought we built were centred on Him, our *Bhakti* movements were pure longings for Him, our temples, our greatest epics were but a mighty sigh for Him, and we did not know. Join Him ! He alone is worthy of the utter self-surrender of which we dreamt. By following Him you render to God the highest glory. Christ alone is worthy to be the heart of Indian culture." Such is the message of the Indian *rishis* to Young India.

Here lie their ashes as seeds in the sand,
Hope for Christ's harvest, my Indian land.

A GREAT people is not wrong in wanting to be free and respected, master in its own house, to be with other nations on a footing of equality and to be the first to profit by its own riches.

— MGR. DE GUEBRIAND

Love Your Motherland

CATHOLICISM AND PATRIOTISM

OF LATE the "Peoples' Theatre Association" stirred Calcutta with a magnificent ballet of folk songs and folk dances called : *India Immortal*.

The first item on the programme was called the "Call of the Drum" and represented the Drummer beating the drum and awakening the youth of the Country.

When they all flocked to him, he instilled in them the sense of patriotism and the call of the nation to unite and fight for freedom.

Whilst watching that highly successful display, did it strike the audience that this magnificent drummer might be the symbol of Christ, "that gentle and unrelenting rebel against untruth and injustice in all its forms" as Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru called Christ in *The Unity of India*?

ALTAR CRY

Rags shall I wear,
Straw shall I eat,
For the sake of thy soul,
My motherland.

And into the street
' Neath trampling feet
I cast all fame
To serve thy name,
O heart's dear flame
My motherland.

Christ thou shalt see
Him shalt thou know,
For the cure of thy soul,
My motherland.

And out from the street
Come millions of feet
In Christ's dear Name,
Yield thee to Him,
My motherland.

N. V. TILAK

International Review of Missions, July 1933

Now the question arises: What is the attitude of Catholicism in regard to Patriotism? The answer is:

"*Christo volle tutti i popoli liberi*", Christ has willed all nations to be free — words of Mgr. Carlo Salotti, Secretary of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. *Le Crisi Della Societa Contemporanea*, 1931

The Catholic Church has always held that patriotism, provided it be in harmony with natural and divine right, is a moral virtue akin to justice. "The love of one's country", said Pius XII, (Cf. Act. Apost. Sedis, 1922, p. 682), "when regulated by Christian law is a powerful source of manifold virtues and acts of heroism." I am not out to prove here that the Church is not antipatriotic; all ill-informed people hold of course that she is. They seem never to have heard the names of Thomas More, Garcia Moreno, Joan of Arc, Daniel O'Connell, Marshal Foch. The Catholic Church has given to the world some of the finest and purest types of patriots and of patriotism.

AMERICA — According to the earliest writers of American history, the real founder of civil and reli-

gious liberty in America was Lord Baltimore, the Catholic founder of the Colony of Maryland, and although this benign rule was finally crushed by bigotry, yet it had not been in vain. Jefferson and Madison made it spring up again. Lord Baltimore's Toleration Act of 1649 was the bright dawn that ushered in the noonday sun of freedom in 1787.

Not only were Catholics the first to establish the principle of civil and religious liberty ; they were among the first to defend those principles in the forum and on the battlefield, and this they did in spite of persecution. The colonial period of America came in soon after Protestantism was established in England, and as the American colonies were all under British rule for over 150 years previous to the Revolution, the same penal laws that opposed so cruelly Catholics in England also oppressed them in America. All this in spite of the fact that the discovery of the New World had been throughout a Catholic enterprise. In the early beginning of American history it was emphatically proclaimed by the dominant Protestant element that "this is a Protestant nation ; that popery and papists have no place in the civil and religious scheme of American institutions : that Catholicism is hostile to civil and religious freedom ; and that Catholics should be debarred from participation in the activities of our national life ". But notwithstanding the various kinds of legal restrictions, religious oaths, etc., it is to the everlasting credit of American Catholics that with superb magnanimity they drew the veil of charity over all past grievances, and when the moment came to fight for American independence, Catholics threw themselves unreservedly and heroically into the glorious battle. Such were, for instance, Sheridan, Meagher, Corcoran, Shields, O'Brian, McMahon and many others. Though in 1776 the Catholic population in the United States of America amounted only to one per cent of the entire population, viz. 20,000 (at present they are 24 million), yet those Catholics enlisted in the army in such proportion, that the Irish Catholic soldiers alone

amounted to one half of the entire fighting force. The famous Irish brigade will never be forgotten in America's fight for freedom. Several Catholics were among the framers of the constitution — Charles Carroll, Daniel Carroll, Thomas Fitzsimmons, Johan Rutledge, James McHerny, Pierce Bulter and George Read.

Reader, I ask you, were American Catholics patriots or were they not?

IRELAND — The Irish together with the Poles are Catholic races who have fought for centuries for their independence, and that in spite of the most terrible persecutions. De Valera, a model Catholic, is also a model patriot if ever there was one, and no true Indian can read the thrilling story of his life without paying homage to this great patriot. De Valera does not stand alone. When spring came to Ireland in 1917, death walked with her, and Ireland suffered many a sad bereavement. Men from the fields and scholars from the schools, who had lavishly spent energy and wealth in a common aspiration for a New Ireland, proved the sincerity of their devotion by the most convincing of all tests, in order that the hopes they had cherished might live in other breasts and in them find fulfilment. Among the foremost who gave their lives were Padraic Pearse, Thomas MacDonagh and Joseph Plunkett, all singers and soldiers of Ireland, heroes with vision, yet simple men who garnered no gold and craved no fame. Padraic Pearse formerly held the chair of literature in the Catholic University College. He gives us a glimpse of his soldier's heart in the following verses written at Christmas 1915 :

O King that was born
To set bondsmen free,
In the coming battle
Help the Gael.

Pearse was also a great *Krista-bhakta*.

I have made my heart clean to-night
As a woman might clean her house
Ere her lover come to visit her,
O Lover, pass not by.

I have opened the door of my heart,
Like a man that would make a feast
For his son's coming home from afar :
Lovely Thy coming, O Son.

And the patriot Joseph Plunkett, who planned in detail the occupation of Dublin, was a mystic of the best tradition of Catholic mysticism. His poems "I See His Blood Upon the Rose" is justly famous :

I see His blood upon the rose
And in the stars the glory of His eyes,
His body gleams amid eternal snows,
His tears fall from the skies.
I see His face in every flower ;
The thunder and the singing of the birds
Are but His voice and, carved by His power,
Rocks are His written words.
All pathways by His feet are worn.
His strong heart stirs the ever-beating sea,
His crown of thorns is twined with every thorn,
His cross is every tree.

Such were the men who were commanders-in-chief of the Easter Rising or leaders of Ireland's Provisional Government.

It was on Easter Monday, April 24, 1916, that, standing at the foot of Nelson's Pillar in Dublin, Padraic Pearse, provisional President of the New Irish Republic, proclaimed Ireland's sovereignty on the following words :

"In the name of God and of the dead generations from which she receives her ancient traditions of nationhood, Ireland through us summons her children to the flag and strikes for freedom."

His execution sealed the truth of his own words :
"Every generation must make protest of blood against foreign domination."

CHINA — A Catholic monastic Order of Chinese Brothers offered its services to the great Chinese citizen M. P. Ma. They were accepted. At once the Brothers started on a journey of 500 *lys* which they covered in 4 days and reached the battlefield where they put

themselves as Red Cross volunteers under the leadership of General Tchu. There were also a few philanthropic societies on the spot, but the noise of the first shells shattered these as a stone would disperse a flight of birds. The Brother-volunteers divided themselves into four groups, served the wounded, carried the dead, devoted themselves night and day and were more than once on the point of being captured by the Japanese troops. It was at 40 *lys* from Peking that the valiant Chinese army was ordered by Peking to yield and capitulate. Only then did the Brothers return to their cloister. After the war, Fr. Lebbe, who is temporarily the spiritual director of the brethren, European by birth but Chinese by nationalization, was given by the Chinese Government the great title of "Tsong Toei Tchang".

Reader, may I ask you once more : Are Catholic Chinese citizens patriots or are they not ?

INDIA — Swami Upadhyaya Brahmabandhav, great Indian leader and great Catholic.

The word Hindu stood in the Swami's mind for a man who belonged to a definite culture.¹ Hindu did not include any religious connotation in the Swami's conception as will be seen from the following passage :

"By birth we are Hindu and shall remain Hindu till death. But as *Dviya* (twice-born) by virtue of our Sacramental re-birth we are Catholic ; we are members of an indefectible Communion embracing all ages and climes. In customs and manners, in observing caste or social distinctions, in eating and drinking, in our life and living, we are genuine Hindus ; but in our faith we are neither Hindu, nor European, nor American, nor Chinese, but all-inclusive. Our faith fills the whole world, and is not confined to any country or race ; our faith is universal and consequently includes all truths ...

"The more strictly we do practise our universal faith, the better do we grow as Hindus. All that is noblest and best in the Hindu character is developed in us

1. Had the Swami lived in our own days of communal bias, he would certainly have preferred the word *Indian*.

by the genial inspiration of the perfect *Narahari* (God-man). The more we love Him, the more we love our country, the more proud we become of our past glory.

"Do we believe in Hinduism? The question must be understood before it can be answered. Hinduism has no definite creed. *Kapila* and *Vyasa* were opposed to each other and yet both of them are considered to be *rishis*.

"In short, we are Hindus so far as our physical and mental constitution is concerned, but in regard to our souls, we are *Catholic* — we are Hindu-Catholic."

F. X. D'Souza, M.A., LL.D., Bar-at-law, I.C.S., Ret. M.L.A., at the 15th Annual Session of the Malabar Catholic Congress said that he was attracted to Malabar by the irresistible call of the Faith and the romantic history of Malabar :

"Truly, your history gives the lie to the sneer of some narrow nationalists to-day who profess to regard Christianity with suspicion as an exotic plant from the West. They forget that Christianity has been planted on your shores earlier than in Western countries, and has as great a claim to be regarded as indigenous as any other. . . . And if your faith has its roots in the remotest past, your achievements in the present are an inspiration and a challenge to the rest of Catholic India. In education, in social service, in organization of works of charity and above all in the development of a virile public life you have achieved a commanding position in these states. You were the first in the field to achieve the principle of self-determination in the government of the Church" (*Indigenous Hierarchy*).²

2. Since that time a sad change of an age-old policy has taken place in the government of the State. There seems to be in Travancore full right of citizenship, worship and freedom of thought for every one in the State except for Christians and Harijans who together form the vast majority of the total population.

Is this a sign of progress?

Mysore, the most progressive of Indian States, is also the most hospitable for the various personalities and various beliefs.

So many achievements of public and social service should be mentioned here, but I wish to conclude: Loyalty to the Church will never stand in the way of genuine patriotism. The Church has no preference for one form of Government over another. Empire, monarchy, republic, *swaraj* are indifferent to her, so long as those forms of government keep in view the *common good* for which authority is constituted. Under any of these governments Catholics are or will be good citizens. Pope Leo XIII has thus described the attitude of the Church: "Catholics, like other citizens, are free to prefer one form of Government to another precisely because no one of these social forms is, in itself, opposed to the principles of sound reason or to the maxims of Christian doctrine."

The "divine right of kings" (very different from the doctrine that all authority whether of king or of republic is from God) has never been sanctioned by the Church. Against the monstrous pretensions of the Renaissance Kings, the pick of Catholic theologians held that *spiritual* authority is not vested in the Crown, and that even *civil* authority is not the immediate gift of God to the king, but is given by God to the people collectively and by them bestowed on the monarch. Authority, Suarez asserted, is an attribute of a multitude assembled to form a State. By their nature they must form a State and a State must have authority. Authority therefore is natural to mankind collectively; and whatever is natural and rational and indispensable for human progress is an ordinance of God. Authority must be, and God will have it to be, but there is no *natural* necessity of authority being all centred in one person. Authority is a divine institution but kings are a human institution. The saying is a platitude in our time; three centuries ago when Suarez wrote, it was a bold and startling pronouncement. His books were burnt publicly in London.

Need it be said that Catholics do not owe civil allegiance to the Pope? This is too evident to need emphasis. In the words of Cardinal Gibbons, the great

American, author of *The Faith of Our Fathers*: "The Catholic takes his religion from Rome but he supplies his own politics."

And if anybody asks whether the Church is anti-democratic, I would quote Woodrow Wilson in his *New Freedom*, p. 85, where he describes the Church's democratic character both at the time of the Middle Ages and at present: "The Roman Catholic Church was *then*, as *now*, a great democracy. There was no peasant so humble that he might not become a priest, and no priest so obscure that he might not become Pope."

TO MY MOTHERLAND

Blessed am I that am born to this land
and that I had the luck to love her.
What care I if queenly treasure is not in her store
but enough is for me the living wealth of her love.
The best gift of fragrance to my heart
comes from her own flowers
and I know not where else shines the moon
that can flood my being with such loveliness.
The first light revealed to my eyes
was from her own sky
and let the same light kiss them
before they are closed for ever.

RABINDRANATH TAGORE

Modern Review, September, 1934

I HAVE never better realized than when reading this book the unpardonable wrong done to the French spirit by the 'lay' State when it effaced from the philosophical curriculum the whole development of Catholic thought from antiquity down to the Middle Ages.

ROMAIN ROLAND
to Fr. de Lubac on his
book *Catholicisme*.

Catholicism, The Bridge Between Eastern & Western Thought

THE INTELLECTUAL task of the Catholic thinker is pregnant with responsibility. As a member of the human race, he has to face with the whole of humanity the ever-new problems of the world. As a member of the Mystical Body, sealed and guaranteed by the one visible Church of Christ, he belongs to eternity, with his mind fixed on unchangeable truth, and his soul centred on the unchangeable God. What, then, is the mission of Catholic thought? It is to think the passing, changeable world in the light of eternal principles. Hence a twofold temptation for the Catholic thinker.

The first danger is to rest satisfied with the contemplation of the eternal principles without deigning to look at the reality about us. Upon the plea of fidelity to eternal principles, a Catholic thinker may be tempted to remain attached, not to the eternal, but to fragments of past history, on whose laurels he thinks he may rest his head in peace. Those who do so mistake divine truth for dying forms, and however great their knowledge, their learning remains barren, incomplete and negative because they fail to be of their time. "*La peur de vivre*" is written on their learned foreheads.

The other danger is the temptation to lose sight, more or less completely, of the eternal, to the advantage of time, and allow oneself to be carried away by the ebb and flow of incomplete systems and passing ideas. Such a Catholic thinker would abdicate, and allow the world

to think him, rather than he think the world. Upon the plea of being practical men, such thinkers in reality surrender to the intellectual laziness of our days, which lacks the courage to strip appearances bare, and which believes that a vague intuition of the heart can take the place of an intellect centred at all costs on the immutable Truth. Sooner or later the world will use them as a play-thing in the great game of instability, and like sodden tree trunks, they will be carried down the stream of the world without leaving any mark.

The vocation of a Catholic thinker may be painful at times. Jacques Maritain, former pupil of Bergson and a convert to Thomism, has expressed this in the following terms :

"Catholic thought must be raised with Christ between heaven and earth and it is by living the painful paradox of an absolute fidelity to the eternal, closely united to the most sedulous comprehension of the anguish of the time, that it is invited to work for the reconciliation of the world and truth."

Many are the paradoxes of the eternal and the temporal which Catholic thinkers are ever anew called upon to face. One such ever-recurring problem is the assimilation of new philosophies in East or West by the eternal philosophy of the Church. When we speak of assimilation by Catholic philosophy, we evidently do not speak of any assimilation or change in the supernatural message of Christ. This heavenly message remains absolutely transcendent, high above the highest speculations of man. The most our human thought can do in this matter is to try to understand better the initial deposit of Faith. Philosophy is absolutely distinct from theology in Catholicism.

By Catholic philosophy, then, we mean the treasure of thought which the Church has collected from humanity and which she has synthetized into a mighty structure. The Church has drawn from both Eastern and Western sources, and the work is still going on. As early as the second century St. Justin, himself a convert to Catholicism, had stated the principle underlying this

assimilation in the following terms: "Anything good and true that was ever uttered in the world is Christian and belongs to us." The reason he gives is that every particle of truth found in this world was originally imparted by the Divine Word (*1st Apology*). This Divine Word, at the beginning of our era, appeared in a human shape in the person of Jesus Christ, but it had been at work in the world from the very beginning.

In Israel the Word spoke by the Prophets and taught by the sacred writers. Outside Israel He spoke and taught by the best philosophers in all that was most healthy in their philosophies. All these systems contain particles of truth which St. Justin calls the seeds of the Word, the seeds of the *Logos spermatikos*. None of these systems has reached or could reach the full Truth which the Word would reveal in person to the world. A greater and earlier writer than St. Justin had said the same:

"That was the true light, which enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world" (JOHN i, 9).

"All things were made by him: and without him was made nothing that was made" (JOHN i, 3).

Jesus Christ is the highest synthesis of the highest human thought in East and West. Turning towards the Greek, He says:

"I am the Way" — indicating the Greek 'Good'.

"I am the Truth" — the Greek 'True'.

"I am the Life" — the Greek 'Beautiful'.

Turning towards the Hindu, He says:

"I am the way" — *Karma mārga*

"I am the Truth" — *Māyā mārga*.

"I am the Life" — *Bhakti mārga*.

CATHOLICISM & WESTERN THOUGHT

From the beginning of Christianity, St. John and the Apologists have tried to express the unchangeable

truth of Christianity, in terms of the philosophy of their time. It was especially in Augustine and Origen that all that was sound in Plato and neo-Platonic thought, seemed to undergo a Christian rebirth. Later on, when at the opening of the twelfth century the approaching forces of monistically-minded Aristotelianism threatened Western thought, Thomas Aquinas appeared, the gifted pupil of a great master. He synthesized the two currents of thought, Aristotelianism and the most essential elements of Platonic thought, and put them at the service of the Cross. He embedded in the structure of Christian theology not only philosophic terms such as "matter", "form", "substance", "accident", "potency", "act", but entire ranges of thought such as the Aristotelian conception of knowledge, the metaphysics of being : all these were translated by him into a Christian form. It was not only Greek and Roman thoughts which were called to a rebirth in the service of Christ. A third element became influential in Christianity, the Germanic element : all those tribes that overthrew the old Roman Empire and set up on its ruins, outside the range of the Graeco-Roman world though not untouched by it, a peculiar mid-European civilization under Teutonic leadership. As Greek culture had put into the service of Christ its thought ; as Rome had put into His service chiefly her organizing power ; so the Germanic races supplied the inner forces and creative activity of their spirituality and the logical study of the relations of faith to the entire range of reality. It was German Christianity which gave the Church Albertus Magnus, the Swabian teacher of St. Thomas Aquinas, and St. Thomas is the greatest gatherer and synthesizer of Truth the world has ever known. I conclude that the best forces of Western thought were invested in Christianity, and all that was saved for posterity was saved through its service of the Cross.

CATHOLICISM & EASTERN THOUGHT

Scholastic philosophy, which has assimilated the thought of so many cultures and built it up into one giant logical structure, claims with reason to be an all-embracing human philosophy, not in the sense that its thought cannot be deepened or that new philosophic thought cannot enrich it, but in the sense that all really human philosophy will run along the lines foreseen in the great universal structure of the *philosophia perennis*, the eternal philosophy of humanity. Now, if Scholasticism is what it pretends to be, it must be able to assimilate Indian philosophy as well as it has assimilated Greek philosophy and the essential philosophy of Islam (Averroes, etc.), which took its philosophy from the Greeks.

Even from the mere philosophic point of view, Catholicism is the only logical outcome of the best values of Hindu thought; and the various schools of Hindu thought are bound to remain as so many jewels strewn in the dust as long as they are not fixed in the lasting setting of Catholicism. This is a giant task indeed, and one which will require generations of the best Indian scholars to complete.

Even so, a beginning has been made by men like P. Johanns, B. Litt. (Oxon.), one of the most brilliant Sanskrit scholars Oxford has produced. This scholar has spent the best part of his life at the task in hidden but strenuous work. Fr. Johanns is not known by the general public, but he is a thinker revered by scholars in East and West. M. L. de la Vallée-Poussin has the highest praise for the editors of the *Light of the East* "qui connaissent dans le détail ce dont ils parlent: point de polémique, aucun argument venu d'Occident: mais avec une sûreté théologique que j'admire et sur le plus mouvant des terrains, un discours de mouvement tout

indien et dont l'information est exemplaire, un commentaire nouveau et persuasif des vieux *Brahmasutras* ”.

In the first number of the *Light of the East*, October, 1922, the editor wrote the following words :

“ We must add this : In the very chapter of St. John's Gospel from which we have quoted it is said of the Word, i.e., of Jesus Christ as God, that He is ‘ the Light that enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world.’ We shall not forget this. We shall ever remember that, before giving to men His supernatural revelation, the Word of God had implanted in their hearts true notions of God, of their origin and of their end.

“ From this dispensation the East has not been excluded : rather it received it abundantly. The East has lights already : religious, philosophical, moral. We have no intention to put out these lights. Rather shall we use them to guide both ourselves and our readers on the path that leads to the fulness of the Light. We shall try to show that the best thought of the East is a bud that, fully expanded, blossoms into Christian thought.”

In the same number Fr. Johannis published an article which was to be the introduction to his standard work, *To Christ through the Vedanta*. This work has been, or is being, translated into several leading languages of the West. I give here an extract from the introduction :

“ Every Catholic student of Vedanta philosophy is soon struck by the fact that there is no important philosophical doctrine of Saint Thomas, the standard philosopher of Catholicism, which is not found in one or the other of the Vedanta systems.

“ Does it follow that Catholic philosophy and Vedanta are the same? No. The Vedanta possesses our philosophical materials, but it has not worked them into one system, one consistent whole.

“ At first sight, the different systems that go under the name of Vedanta seem to contradict one another. We must also grant that the Vedanta philosophers copiously refute each other. But we must distinguish

between the positive doctrines of each school and its negative doctrines.

"The Vedanta doctrines are not self-contradictory, they contradict each other. This is due to each different system (Advaita, Visistadvaita, Dvaita, Dvaitadvaita, etc.), mistaking one great limb of Truth for its complete body.

"So, to an outside but sympathetic student, the Vedanta offers the sight of a heap of loose limbs that awaits a common soul to arise to life and progress.

"We have said that in the Catholic philosophy of St. Thomas, we find all the important doctrines met with in the Vedanta. But in the Thomistic system we have an organic whole. It is one harmony in which the different Vedantic systems find their proper setting. Their discordance disappears. The loose members combine into one organism, one harmonious body of Truth.

"But if it be so — and it will be our task in ensuing articles to show that it is so — then there is no gulf between Vedanta and Catholic philosophy. The gulf lies not between Vedanta and Catholic philosophy; it lies between the various Vedanta systems themselves. If the Vedanta philosophers will only bring their several positive statements into harmony, if they will only adjust and thus partially limit their assertions, they will turn disconnected doctrines into a system, and that system will be Thomism, or something akin to Thomism.

"Our contention is, therefore, that the Vedanta philosophies move in the same direction as Catholic philosophy. Only since they have not met yet, it must be evident that they have not yet reached the goal towards which they all tend. They are still strugglers on the road, not yet in the possession of Truth, which all admit to be one. The Hindus will find Christ if they find themselves fully.

"We would like to manifest this to the Hindus. We would like to make it clear to them that we tread common ground with them — that there is a way which leads to Christ through the Vedanta.

"Will they listen and then judge?"

IDEALS are like stars — we never reach them, but like the mariners on the sea we chart our course by them.

KARL SCHURZ

Catholic Renaissance In Indian Art

CATHOLICISM & INDIAN ART

ART MAY be defined as the clothing of spirit in matter by an artist or artisan in order to produce the soothing spell, the harmonizing power and the binding force of something beautiful. Beauty is essentially the object of our intellect, though our senses also play a part in the enjoyment of the beautiful in as far as they serve the mind. The great model of Art is nature itself, where every being is clothed in a participated radiance of the unchangeable, undiluted and absolute source of all beauty : the Great Spirit : *GOD*. That, perhaps, is the reason why all great art in Egypt, Greece, Europe, India, has always been fundamentally religious. The symbolization of the beautiful in creation speaks a universal language, because it expresses the most intimate properties of our own mind, integrity, proportion, brightness or clarity. Before the beautiful the human mind finds itself, in the words of Jacques Maritain, "like a stag at the spring of running water ; it has nothing to do but to drink and it drinks the clarity of being ". Art *by itself* has no purpose. It is neither Christian, nor Hindu, nor anything else ; it is simply the *splendor veritatis* : the splendour of truth. When we talk of Christian art, it simply means that artists truly express and symbolize the world and man according to the Christian conception of the world.

In this sense it is the *accidental* but sublime mission of art to surround with glory here on earth the beauty of beauties: Christ and His own; to make His glory known to men, to shape their imagination.

A Christian artist tries to give to his work the features of goodness, truth and beauty all shining in the new light of Christ. It should be noted that not all art painted by a Christian is Christian art, nor are Christian subjects, e.g. Christian saints, necessarily painted in Christian art. Only that art is Christian which is inspired by the Christian conception of life. In order to be a perfect Christian artist, one should be a saint besides being a great artist. Says Fra Angelico, the mystic of Italian painters:

"Art demands great tranquillity, and to paint the things of Christ, the artist must live with Christ."

The essence of Christian art is contained in that single phrase of this great medieval artist.

The famous Flemish painting, "The Adoration of the Lamb"¹ took twenty years to finish. When the painters, the two brothers Van Eyck were about to paint the central figure, the Lamb, symbol of Christ, they deemed themselves unworthy, but called their sister, a nun, from the cloister, and she it was who on her knees, painted the Lamb, the last figure of the famous triptych.

Catholicism as such has no art of its own, but it has inspired innumerable schools of art of the most varied and famous cultures. The technique and characteristics of any art can express the Christian conception of life. The first Christian churches were basilicas, an eastern type of building which was the largest type of assembly-building of the time. Outside the Roman empire, in Persia for instance, the churches were built in quite different styles. When the Spanish kings had reconquered their territories from the Moors, churches were built in the captured cities in predominantly Muslim style. In Germany, England, France, Italy,

1. Twice during the last two great wars the Germans stole it; and twice they have had to return it.

churches were built and decorated with belfries, rose-windows, altar-paintings, etc., according to the particular taste and genius of each nation. The most beautiful of the old Gothic churches is perhaps Chartres in France. St. Peter's in Rome is among the finest achievements of Catholic Art in the line of neo-classical renaissance.*

Not all the styles or all those churches are equally beautiful or equally appealing to everyone ; but all have a right to be in the service of Christ, and many of them make a universal appeal.

Chartres, Reims, Cologne, Antwerp, Paris, Milan are so many names that will call up beautiful remembrances in the mind of Indian travellers in Europe. Is it necessary to mention some of the most famous Catholic artists of Europe? Musicians can never forget Bethoven, Bellini, Elgar, Gounod, Haydn, Mascagni, Mozart, Palestrina, Perosi, Verdi. Painters all over the world know Angelico, Giotto, Michelangelo, Raphael, Rubens, Ferrari, Rembrandt. The names of the architects of cathedrals are mostly unknown. Not so their cathedrals!

Now we may ask: What is the future Art of Catholicism to be in India? The answer is simple: Thoroughly, thoroughly Indian. That is the unmistakable mind of Rome, as appears for instance from the questionnaire of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda to the superiors of the missions in 1922: "Whether in the constructions and decorations of sacred buildings and in the dwellings of the missionaries, they were solely adopting the foreign styles of art or whether on the contrary they were to preserve as far as possible the local artistic decorations?"

The late representative of the Pope in China, Mgr. C. Constantini, Delegate Apostolic, addressed the following letter to the missionaries; I apologize for quoting it at some length.

2. See, for instance, *Modern Review*, Dec. 1934, the glowing tribute to the artistic values of the Italian churches by a picked group of Indian women students and teachers.

"I think it convenient to express my mind as regards the artistico-religious problem in China, a problem of far greater importance than one might feel inclined to grant at first sight, and which it is already high time we should study seriously. Up to now the problem has been solved in a Western sense. From Canton to Peking, in the most remarkable towns of China, our Church buildings bear the print of neo-Gothic or neo-Roman style. Let us ask ourselves: 'Is this to continue?' I answer 'No.' I do not blame what has been done so far. Every one meant to do what he thought best. But since in the mission field we ought always to progress, I should like to lay down certain principles for the future church buildings. In affirming that our church buildings must put off their Western dress and find inspiration in the local art and in the feelings of the Chinese people, I do not affirm anything new. The Sacred Congregation of Propaganda, with that wisdom born of the experience of centuries, and that prudence and broad-mindedness sprung from the habit of contemplating things from the supernatural plane, gave already in 1659 the opportune directions to be followed on this particular point. The principle is therefore beyond discussion. Hence, what I want now to bring out is the opportunity and possibility of putting it in practice. And I shall do it by studying the problem from the artistic, historical and religious point of view.

"I. From the Point of View of Art.—Every race has its peculiar and well-defined characteristics which find their most solemn expression in architecture. These different artistic characteristics are a result of various elements: culture, customs, taste, historical and religious facts, material of construction available, temperature and atmospheric conditions of the place in question. It is therefore an artistic blunder to bring here such styles as the Roman or the Gothic. Over there in Europe, these styles were things born spontaneously on the soil and therefore living realities; here they are artificial flowers, dead elements of art; there they expressed the taste and feelings of the people, they were

the living language of the race ; here they will always be foreign importations, a language unknown to the people. To speak only of the Gothic style, it contains sloping roofs to cause the snow to slide down.

" II. From the Point of View of Religion.— The importation into China of a foreign architecture betrays a missionary method which is not without defect. It is recognized that one of the greatest obstacles to the spread of the Christian religion in China is the Chinese prejudice that the Christian religion is a foreign importation. This is the reason why both bishops and missionaries are doing their utmost to purge our religion from this fatal prejudice : we have never intended, nor do we intend to ignore, much less to hurt, the legitimate patriotism of the Chinese : on the contrary we owe it the homage of our loyal respect and the acknowledgment of its right to be... Let us therefore emphasize even in architecture and sacred decoration, the Catholicity of the Church. I happened to see in a poor little village a small church built by a local mason ; its facade looked so gentle and so Chinese ! It was a Latin page finely and delicately translated into Chinese. That humble and ignorant worker knew unconsciously the true artistic tradition of the Church. Let us follow this noble tradition...

" III. The Point of View of History. — When the Church came out of the catacombs, she made use of the artistic elements she found in her surroundings ; and thus from the Roman house and the civil basilica (royal palace) she got the idea of the Christian basilica. Far from fighting shy of assimilating pagan elements, she did not hesitate to enter the pantheon and consecrate it to the cult of the true God. Christian Art goes onward from century to century, renewing itself continually and transforming itself with the Renaissance into the neo-classical style. It lives by giving expression to the exuberant life of the Church which is nowhere a stranger, and, with her powerful genius, masters and subdues all forms of art, placing them at her own service. Let us not stop in China this triumphal march of Christian art."

This is the mind of the Catholic Church about art. Catholic India will have to follow.

The Catholic Artists' Guild in Japan is famous throughout the empire, including non-Catholic artistic circles, especially for its three foremost members: Seikyo Okayama, Luke Hasegawa, Miss Kemiko Kozeki. This guild held several exhibitions in Tokyo. Seikyo Okayama has painted several masterpieces for the Lateran Museum in Rome.

Catholic China is proud of Mr. Luke Teheng who by dint of painting Christian subjects became himself a Catholic.

Mr. Angelo da Fonseca, a Goan artist, who belongs to the Tagore school, is a pioneer in India, and Catholics are proud of him. India and the Church are expecting a great work from him.

We dream of Catholic churches and shrines, Catholic schools, hospitals, universities, Catholic priests' homes — all built according to the best traditions of Indian art and decorated by the best schools of Indian sculpture and Indian painting...As Father Heras puts it: "Our goal is to understand the constructive and decorative language of Indian architecture to perfection; and, once understood, to make it express Christian ideas, viz. to build a church according to the exigencies and requirements of Canon Law but in Indian architecture."

In our churches and processions, we wish to hear, together with the Gregorian chant (which more resembles Eastern than Western music), the Vedic tunes and the emotional *bhakti* tunes of North and South. It should be noticed that much has been achieved already in certain Catholic centres unknown so far to the general public.

In *Indian Arts and Letters*, 1934, first issue, the wish was expressed that the West may come to appreciate Indian art. I believe that a spiritual and international force with a unique artistic temperament and tradition, as Catholicism is, would be the providential medium. A logical Catholic cannot help loving sincerely

all that humanity has produced in the line of beauty and truth. Is that the reason why Mulk Raj Anand, when publishing for the European public his book, *The Hindu View of Art*, asked for an introduction from the famous English Catholic artist Eric Gill?

Indian artists of all ranks, there is a work to be done in and outside India. If you feel in you the making of a true artist, remember that none of your talents need remain idle. Universality and Catholicity are already featured in the grand Indian talent displayed, for instance, during the Congress Nagar Exhibition at Ramgarh, in 1940; or during the Annual Exhibition at Calcutta in 1946, in the exhibits of Samarendra Nath Ghose, Makhan Dutta Gupta, Adinath Mukherjee, Anil Kumar Paul and others. Christ calls on you. Cathedrals and churches are needed, paintings and sculptures, music, vessels of all shapes, textiles of cotton, wool, or palm fibre, genuine Indian tapestries of sober and varied motive and hues, epics, dramas, literature of all kinds — and all this inspired both by the great Indian, and by the Catholic ideas. Who will be the first to start a great Catholic-Indian film manufacturing industry such as exists in Paris, in Brussels, in Holland, etc.? At least, who is ready to finance the undertaking? The films produced need not be on Catholic subjects. Leaders like Mr. Satyamurthi of Madras would surely welcome a Catholic firm in India which would guarantee to the public a picked series of films, thoroughly pure and highly cultural and really human and Indian in the best sense of the word. Indian artists, Christ calls on you. By serving Him, you serve your country; by singing Him, you sing in honour of the Highest. Remember, Catholic means Universal.

The Catholic idea, once understood by the best artists of the country, could not fail to stir up an artistic renaissance throughout India. Indian artists, you will never find a higher model and a grander inspiration than Jesus Christ.

"He who governs the beautiful world with His spirit is Himself the most Beautiful One."— BOETIUS.

THE mysticism of love cannot be treated with the vocabulary of our days.

NICHOLAS BERDYAEV

Who is Woman's True Liberator ?

NO ONE addressing women can do so without a deep sense of respect and responsibility. World disorders, some of recent date, others going back to the origin of the human race, are clamouring for solutions. Physical, moral and social problems, affecting the future—nay the very existence of the nations—are awaiting the touch of that hand which, whilst rocking the cradle, rules the world. The world is sick and needs the nursing care of our mothers and sisters more than all our patent remedies.

In the first place, women must understand the evil. The world has lost the sense of life, above all the sense of higher life, of divine life. So much has been warped. Humanity, country, family, individual life, natural life, supernatural life, all these are misunderstood. The world lives on absurd principles which have landed us in the present world confusion.

Now, woman has the sense of life. She gives it. She may lose the true ideal, or at times follow an incomplete or erroneous ideal with disastrous results for herself and for society ; but when she has the true ideal, she has it in a greater degree. She is more devoted, more ingenious, more persevering.

One of the interesting publications in modern India is a symposium called *Our Cause* edited by Shyam Kumari Nehru. In this volume 30 eminently qualified Indian ladies survey the diverse problems of women in India. The book proves up to the hilt that " Indian women are awakening, and is evidence that a great

social revolution is preparing in India" (R. PALME DUTT). Most of his lectures are brilliantly written and well thought out.

No one will deny that a social revolution was necessary to break the shackles that the Codes of Manu, for instance, had imposed on woman: "A wife, a son, a slave, these three equally are destitute of property: whatever they acquire becomes his property to whom they belong"; and again: "The father protects in maidenhood, the husband protects in youth, the son protects in old age. A woman is not entitled to independence" (MANU). — What is strange is that the present uplift and revolution in woman's status is credited to Soviet Russia.

In the Introduction of *Our Cause* I read: "For the first time in the history of the modern world womanhood has been emancipated: the credit for giving complete equality to both sexes must go to Soviet Russia. In Russia the welfare of woman receives primary consideration and woman has at last acquired the same rights and privileges as man."

Again on the last page of the last paragraph of the book I read:

"Russia is the only country which is trying to solve the marriage problem seriously and scientifically."

It is a pity that a scientific comparative study has been made in the book comparing the status of women in Russia with that of women in other parts of the world, for I fear that on balance not so many women in other parts of the world would be willing to exchange their lot with that of their sisters in Mother Russia. Emancipated women existed long before the birth of Lenin and Stalin.

This does not mean that the status of women in other parts of the world is ideal. In India, especially, the vindication of woman's rights in education, in industries, in social and political spheres, has only just begun. None better than G. K. Chesterton has stressed the need of a revolution in the direction of true emancipation.

In *What is Wrong with the World*, he tells of an official in a certain industrial area in England, who took it upon himself to enforce certain ideas on hygiene by ordering the hair of the little girls of the area to be cropped. On that occasion G. K. Chesterton writes :

"I begin with a little girl's hair. That I know is a good thing at any rate. Whatever else is evil, the pride of a good mother in the beauty of her daughter is good. It is one of those adamantine tendernesses which are the touchstones of every age and race. If other things are against it, other things must go down. If landlords and laws and science are against it, landlords and laws and science must go down. With the red hair of one she-urchin in the gutter I will set fire to all modern civilization ; because a girl should have long hair, she should have clean hair ; because she should have clean hair, she should not have an unclean home ; because she should not have an unclean home, she should have a free and leisured mother ; because she should have a free mother, she should not have a usurious landlord ; because there should not be a usurious landlord, there should be a redistribution of property ; because there should be a redistribution of property, there shall be a revolution. That little urchin with the golden hair (whom I have just watched toddling past my house), she shall not be lopped and lamed and altered ; her hair shall not be cut short like a convict's. No, all the kingdoms of the earth shall be hacked about and mutilated to suit her. The winds of the world shall be tempered to that lamb unshorn. All crowns that cannot fit her head shall be broken ; all raiment and building that does not harmonize with her glory shall waste away. Her mother may bid her bind her hair, for that is a natural authority ; but the Emperor of the Planets shall not bid her to cut it off ; she is the human and sacred image ; all around the social fabric shall sway and split and fall, the pillars of society shall be shaken, and the roofs of ages come rushing down, and not one hair of her head shall be harmed."

Woman's emancipation requires first of all the vindication of woman's rights and independent personality. The spirit, however, that should animate the men and women engaged in this struggle should be a spirit of real service and charity. This struggle should not develop into a new class-war or caste-war, transferred to the domain of sex.

Modern training too often deforms woman along two directions. One is exaggerated intellectualism. Reactions often overstep their own premises, and it is natural that past intellectual slavery of woman in India should result in a training where the intellect would be developed at the expense of the finer feelings of heart and soul. Surely, we in India need women of the type of Madame Curie, co-discoverer of radium. Yet science alone cannot take the place of wisdom and love.

The other danger is extreme sentimentalism.

This, too, is natural in an age when the feverish thumping of the machine is apt to throw into disorder the vital rhythm of our nerves. Purely sentimental "reasons" for doing or not doing things are often fraught with danger.

The training of character and will is essential for the sake of womanhood itself and for the sake of the motherland. "Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control, these three alone lead life to sovereign power" says Tennyson.

Sentimentalism is bred by naturalism, and it is unfortunate that naturalism has invaded our official educational system — we are all tainted with the doctrine that science and all the rest of it is the servant of but one life, the physical one, to the exclusion of the inner life. This naturalism in the school, together with the modern novel and the modern cinema, which primarily cater for the nervous and the weak, are the chief causes which have set the heart of many women dizzy with outraged modesty and sick with melancholy. May we not add another cause of neurasthenia among some of our married sisters? More wives

suffer from nerves on account of empty cradles than on account of full homes. In this matter, as in many others, nature, as well as the moral law, takes toll for the violation of her laws. The contraceptionist can logically have no other conception of woman than that she is a kind of prostitute whose only *raison d'être* is his own self-gratification. History will tell about many mothers and fathers of this birth-control age who were schooled in lust and not in love.

With the best of our sisters and brothers we dream of a womanhood, healthy in body, in heart, and in mind. The world of to-morrow will look up to woman for leadership, provided she knows how to hold her balance in the present world-storm, keeping her eyes fixed on a reliable compass, and steering unflinchingly the boat of life, family, and nation.

Berdyaev, the great Russian Christian thinker, writes in *The End of Our Time*: "Woman is bound more closely than man to the souls, and it is through her that he reaches communion with them. It is the 'eternal feminine' that has so great a future in coming history, not the emancipated woman or the epicene creature. The mysticism of love cannot be treated with the vocabulary of our days." True emancipation is overdue; but it is clear that, for instance, the "free union" emancipation of Karl Pearson is miles apart from what true humanity will consider emancipation. Certain remedies proposed as a cure for women's subjection might prove worse than the disease itself. History in East and West proves that it is not true that woman is most esteemed and loved where she has most freedom. Freedom unhelped by a higher law is bound sooner or later to lead to slavery. If woman is fully to come into her own, it can be only in the light of a true ideal.

Is there such an ideal? An ideal historical enough and actual enough and worthy enough to be a beacon of light to woman in her struggle for true emancipation and active service? There exists such an ideal; it is none other than Jesus Christ. Woman's real

liberator and woman's highest ideal of service is Jesus Christ. True, in the message of Christ we do not find ready-made formulas of emancipation catalogued and labelled as in modern books; but the spirit and principles of Christ's message were bound from the outset to revolutionize the old conception of womanhood. The first emancipating principle of Christianity is the recognition of woman's personality on an equal level with that of man. St. Paul expressed this truth in the following terse sentence, which may be called the Charter of Woman's Freedom: In Christ "there is neither Jew nor Greek: there is neither bond nor free: *there is neither male nor female*. For you are all one in Christ Jesus" (GAL. iii, 28).

Christ is full of love and respect for the soul of every human being. The soul of a woman has the same value as the soul of a man. What is sin in man is also sin in woman! None is absolute lord, none slave! The great command of Christ: "Love one another" applies in a particular manner to the relation between man and woman. So high are the mutual relations between man and woman, that St. Paul compares them to the relation of Christ and His Church:

"Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the church, and delivered himself up for it" (EPH. v, 25).

Christ regarded woman as a person with an immortal destiny of her own, independent of that of her husband. Her rights and duties in this respect are equal to those of her husband. The supreme value in the life of woman is her personality and her personal destiny. And no woman can relinquish to her husband the burden of her personality and consequently the fate of the immortal destiny to which Christ calls her. The citizenship of the future world will involve neither marriage nor giving in marriage but will consist in the eternal espousals of God with our souls. Hence sex is not the only factor in human nature. Furthermore, Christ never equated womanhood with motherhood. Did He not recognize on one occasion that there was something higher even than motherhood?

"Who is my mother, and who are my brethren?" (MATT. xii, 48). The answer was: Those who do God's will.

Hence Christianity has always kept an honourable place for virginity and widowhood. There is no need here to expatiate on virginity. We have only to look about us in the world to notice the splendid growth of convents to which Christianity has given rise, and the honour in which they are held.

In Catholicism it is a high honour for a woman, and a token of a special call of Christ, to spend her life in convent or cloister, purely in the service of God and of God's child: humanity. The virginity of which there is question here is not something merely negative. It consists primarily in a positive and loving surrender of the soul to God. It is not out of fear of life, but out of a passionate love for God and for mankind, that there are thousands of the noblest Catholic virgins who in the flower of youth freely leave family, friends, wealth, in order to be affianced to the great Bridegroom of mankind and to serve Man in Christ.

The Christian widow is free to remarry, but if she prefers to remain as she is, she will not be despised. If she be poor, the Church will help her; one of the chief works of charity recommended to the faithful is "to visit the widows and the fatherless". St. James alludes to it when summing up in a few words the characteristics of true piety: "Religion clean and undefiled before God and the Father is this: to visit the fatherless and widows in their tribulation: and to keep one's self unspotted from this world" (JAMES i, 27).

But all widows are not poor. There are those who, instead of asking help from others, are ready to help others, and can devote themselves all the more easily to charitable works and social service as their condition gives them more leisure, especially if there are no children or these are already settled. From the very beginning Christianity has known how to convert widows into ministers of public charity. If in point of merit the Christian virgin has always

been placed above the married woman and the widow, the widow, in turn, has always held the first rank in relation to Catholic Action, works of mercy and social activity. The "deaconesses" in the early Church were the first proof of this, and even nowadays, numerous are the widows who spend their time, their wealth and their love on the immense field of suffering humanity, out of love for Christ.

But, it may be said this exaltation of the virgin and the widow is secured only by depreciating the married woman, that is to say, the majority of women! Nothing is farther from the truth. For Christ, who ennobled virginity and widowhood has also ennobled the married state. In fact, the better to emphasize the particular greatness of an institution which assures the perpetuity of the human race, Christ has made Marriage between Christians a sacrament, like Baptism and the Eucharist, and He has willed that this sacrament should create a bond that only death can dissolve. The sacrament of marriage is far from being a mere religious ceremony. It is a visible sign of Christ's grace, and is founded and modelled on Christ's own wedding with His Spouse: the Church. In Holy Matrimony, Christ does not come between man and woman, since He Himself is the appointed Bond who guarantees the mutual respect of man and woman for each other's personality and destiny. Women owe to Christ two other essential securities: the irrevocable suppression of polygamy and the absolute interdiction of divorce. These two institutions are invalid, sinful and dishonourable in Catholicism and every Catholic knows it. Hence that new name for an ugly thing, "trial marriage", does not exist in Catholicism, and if it tries to exist in individual cases, it is called by its true name which is very old and not very pleasant.

"The young man really in love believes that his love will last for ever, and that there is no other girl worth looking at on earth; and the girl feels exactly as he does." — CHESTERTON.

CHRIST & WOMAN

Careful perusal of the New Testament brings to our notice a number of women who came in direct contact with the Saviour, and it is a remarkable fact that none of these passed from His presence without an act of faith or an act of love or an act of contrition. Throughout the pages of the four Gospels there is no record of a woman rejecting the words of Christ. It was a woman who first understood the tremendous message of Christ's divinity, whereas Nicodemus, the learned Pharisee, had not grasped at first the meaning of Jesus' words (JOHN iii, 1-21). Mothers came to Him with their babes. He made way for them, took the little ones, blessed them and pointed a lesson to His own initiated disciples. A little girl, the daughter of Jairus, was raised by Him from the dead: With immense power and sweetness, He restored her both to life and to health. A widow followed the bier of her dead son; Christ was touched by her misery and gave her back her beloved son. In the crowd of followers there was another woman having an issue of blood for twelve years; she touched the hem of His garment and was healed. In gratitude she raised the voice of eternal motherhood to acclaim the Mother of Christ: "Blessed is the womb that bore Thee and the breasts that gave Thee suck." And was He not often at Bethany the guest of the two noble sisters, Mary and Martha, whose brother He raised to life again? Endless is the procession of immortal women who move through the Gospel pages, obtaining help from Christ and reverence.

But benevolence and reverence do not exhaust Christ's relation to women. There is something deeper, something that woman craves for as she craves for life. There was love in Christ for woman. He proved it. He risked something for her and he who does not love does not know what it is to take a risk. Once or twice Christ risked even His human reputation and His honour

to save a woman taken in adultery. The self-righteous Scribes and Pharisees wished to stone her according to an ancient law ; they brought her first to Jesus and asked Him : " Master, this woman was even now taken in adultery. Now Moses in the law commanded us to stone such a one. But what sayest thou ? " But He, the sinless and pure Jesus, knew what was in their heart. He did not condemn that woman because He knew that men had the greatest share in making that woman what she was : a being devoid of the sense of responsibility, without rights and value. He simply said : " Let the one who is without sin cast the first stone at her." Then He bowed down and wrote in the sand. What He wrote we do not know, but one by one the accusers left the place beginning with the eldest. When He rose, He was left alone with the woman. Then He told her : " Woman, where are they that accused thee ? Hath no man condemned thee ? " — Who said : " No man, Lord." And Jesus said : " Neither will I condemn thee. Go, and now sin no more " (JOHN viii 3-11,).

The moving story of Mary Magdalen is well-known. Another woman wiped His bleeding face on that last sorrowful journey when He carried His cross on His bleeding shoulders to Calvary ; when a group of women pitied and lamented Him on this way of the Cross, He halted and spoke to them ; and when the apostles, (men) had fled, a group of women stood close to the Cross throughout the sorrowful agony ; His first appearance after His Resurrection was to a Mary.

THE BRIDEGROOM

No matter what your state in life may be, every woman is called to be affianced to Christ in baptism and to prepare for the eternal espousals in heaven.

Christ is the Bridegroom of the whole of humanity and every man and woman owes fidelity to Him. Love between man and woman must always leave room for these espousals of Christ and be faithful to Him, or risk to turn human love into lust, personality into a toy, and family life into a hell.

What is the deepest power in the soul of a woman but a thirst for love and affection, a desire to give even more than to receive? Was there ever a woman who did not feel that the whole of life was love? Who does not know that this is the secret of woman's strength and weakness? In her power to love or hate (another, often a corrupted, form of love) lies the inalienable immortal destiny of woman.

Who shall be the supreme object of such a power of love? One alone is worthy! One alone is capable of satisfying the immense capacity for love of a woman's heart. My dear Indian sister, you want an object that you can love even to adoration? You want to love a real person even unto the abandonment of self; without, however, losing your personality? You want a love that will never, never prey upon your weakness? You want a love that will sanctify your love towards your husband, your children, your country? You want a love that will inspire you with heroism in the service of your motherland? You will find it in Jesus Christ, the Bridegroom of your soul, the Bridegroom of Humanity.

WOMEN VOLUNTEERS

Not only at the dawn of Christianity, but throughout history, women have been among the most faithful of Christ's disciples. It was often women who introduced Jesus Christ to the hearth of the ancient consular families of Rome; it was they who whispered

His Name in familiar converse, or who taught by the more persuasive methods of personal example — and when called upon to defend their beloved Rabboni with their very blood, they rivalled men in faith and courage. Little Agnes is the sweetest of the long *cortège* of white-robed martyrs, who testified to Christ in Rome, Persia, and later in Japan, America and many other countries.

Very early the mission of women took truly noble proportions when the queens of the most brilliant courts of Europe converted their husbands, and often their nations, to the Faith of Christ. Queen Clotilda heads the long line of Christ's volunteers who at the dawn of the modern world were teachers and leaders of nations. The conversion of the Franks, the glory of which she shares with the Bishop of Reims, altered the centre of gravity of history.

The neighbours across the Channel soon followed the Frankish example. It was a woman who unlocked the door of England to the forty missionaries sent by the Pope of Rome. And this woman was none other but the great grand-daughter of Clotilda — Bertha. She had been given in marriage to King Ethelbert of Kent on condition that she should be allowed the free exercise of her religion. At first she lived for many years as the only Christian at the pagan court of Canterbury. It was she who gradually persuaded her husband and her nation to embrace the Catholic Faith. Ethelbert was the first to be baptized in the kingdom of Kent.

Ethelberga, the daughter of Ethelbert, by marrying King Edwin of Northumbria, carried the Faith among the Angles of whom Pope Gregory had desired to make angels. She, too, made of her husband a Christian king. It was also Christian women who presided over or co-operated at the conversion of the kingdoms of the Lombards, the Visigoths, and who definitely "planted" the Catholic Church in Italy and Spain. Clotsinda, daughter of Clotair I, became the wife of the Lombard King Albuin and attempted the

conversion of the king and of the kingdom ; but she died in the flower of her youth before being able to realize her dream. With her the hope of planting the Cross in Lombardy seemed to have vanished in the dust of the tomb. Yet, in 589, Theodolinda, the fair and pious daughter of Duke Garibald, was married to Authari, King of the Lombards. When her husband died, the Lombards decided to elect as their king the prince on whom Queen Theodolinda should decide to bestow her hand. Her choice fell on Duke Agilulf. She gradually converted her husband to the faith, and the cathedral of Monza, near Milan, where subsequently the coronation of all the Lombard kings took place, is the work of Theodolinda. In Spain it was a mother who in her two sons, Hermenegilda and Reccared, gave Spain her first martyr and her first Christian king.

By 589 the West was converted and the four outstanding nations belonged to the Catholic Faith.

In the ninth century we find again the myrrh-bearers of Christ at work among the Slav nations. Princess Ludmila, whom the grateful Church venerates as a saint, was converted to Catholicism about the year 879, together with her husband Borivoj. It was she who gave to Bohemia the great and saintly king Wenceslas, who up to this day remains a more popular hero than John Huss. Both mother and son died martyrs of the faith, but, here as everywhere else, the blood of martyrs was the seed of new Christians.

In Poland it was Dubrava who in 965 became the Clotilda of her race. In Russia it was Queen Olga (969), converted to Catholicism, who, like Theodosia, triumphed from her tomb. (For more details see *St. Clotilda* by G. Kurt ; Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.)

My Indian sisters, you too are the queens of your families, the queens of the Indian nation of to-morrow. Christ wishes not only to live in you ; He also wishes to live in your children, in your nation, and He calls on you to be His volunteers. Will you follow Him and bring India to Christ ?

C O M M U N I S M witnesses
to an unaccomplished task of
Christianity.

NICHOLAS BERDYAEV

The Economic Structure Of a Nation

CATHOLICISM, being the religion of man, necessarily covers the whole range of human life and activity. For man is in need not only of forgiveness, he is also in need of light and food, honest work and rest. He is also in need of a happy family life, of economic freedom and social security, of human consolation, of culture and of self-respect. Hence Catholicism considers all planning that truly tends to save these values as ways of God.

The Social Problem concerns the poor and the rich, the "haves" and the "have-nots".

Now the first thing to note is that there are two kinds of poor.

First there are the poor, who owing to an accident, a calamity or an illness (not due to habitual poverty), have fallen victim to misery and want. When thinking of these, Jesus said that "the poor will always be with you". In fact, this kind of poverty and misery is in a sense a direct consequence of original sin, and even supposing we could revolutionize the world into a land of perfect justice, still there would remain among us the poor, the cripple, the blind, the lame, the sick, the uncared-for widows and orphans. We must fight disease and poverty even in them; but we will never fully succeed. Those poor will always remain con-

fided to the loving care of Charity. They are not directly the subject of this chapter. If anyone wants to know what the Church did for them in the past and does in the present, I refer them for instance, to *The Church and Healing* — Calvert Series ; or to *The Catholic Encyclopædia*. Here we only assert: In any human society *there must be room for them*.

But there is a second kind of poverty and want which would not exist if there were more justice in this world: the world of men, women and children who, in spite of a great capital of energy and (initial) health, do not receive a just share of the world's wealth and are doomed, on account of man's injustice to live in physical, and often moral, misery. This oppressed proletariat of town and field, in the East or in the West, has to be helped not only by works of charity but first of all by the strict laws of justice which clamour for their rights. " To come and tell those people: ' Blessed are they that mourn ' is a piece of irony which cries for vengeance ; it is a diabolical deformation of the Sermon on the Mount." — *Osservatore Romano*, 3 April 1930.

On the other hand, when Jesus speaks about the rich, we must again distinguish, as did Jesus Himself. First there are those whose hearts are attached to riches as to an ideal to which everything else is sacrificed, those also who give themselves over to a life of selfish enjoyment, those also who are deaf to personal or social reform, or who believe that by a little tinkering at the present social and economic system all will be all right provided they remain in possession of their privileges.

It is these last especially who, with good reason, have called the Gospel a code of anarchy. Christ uses strong language indeed when speaking of this class of people.

" Woe to you that are rich " (LUKE vi, 24).

" And again I say to you: It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven " (MATT. xix, 24).

"Those who accept the view of life and welfare taught by Christianity and reason, cannot, if they take the trouble to consider the matter, avoid the conclusion that the amount of material goods which can be expended in the rational and justifiable satisfaction of the senses is very much smaller than is to-day assumed by the great majority of persons." In this sense it is true to say the chief sins of our time are not personal but social.

Next we have to consider the causes of India's poverty.

One is the apathy of the intellectuals in India towards the poor.

A second is the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few capitalists, both Indian and foreign.

A third cause is an administration that is not primarily centred on the welfare of the people of the country.

As regards the first cause: The blame for India's poverty goes to many of India's intellectuals, who, though educated with the wealth of the nation, allow their gifts and talents to rot away in idleness in urban areas only.

Just as the material wealth, so also the intellectual wealth of the nation is being allowed to accumulate and to waste away in the hands of the few in the towns. For instance many towns abound with doctors and with a good number of honest lawyers; but these two classes of men refuse to practise in rural India, leaving the black-market trade in Law and Medicine wide open in rural areas.

Catholicism appeals for a better distribution of the intellectual wealth of the nation, and for a greater sense of social responsibility.

Modern Capitalism, Indian and foreign alike, is the second cause of India's poverty.

According to Dr. P. M. Titus: "5 p.c. owns 35 p.c. of the wealth of India"; about 70% of the nation's wealth is centralized in the hands of capitalists.

However, in fairness we must hold that the greatest capitalist of all has been Government itself, and this brings us to the third cause of India's poverty, viz. :

A Government that rules the country not primarily in the interest of the people. Now, Catholicism holds that no imperialism or colonization in any part of the world is ever justified if it denies that the welfare of the people under its control comes first and not second. In this matter what are the records of the present Government? Was India governed primarily for the benefit of India?

"We did not conquer India for the benefit of the Indians. I know that it is said at missionary meetings that we have conquered India to raise the level of Indians. That is cant, we conquered India by the sword and by the sword we shall hold it. We hold it as the finest outlet for British goods." - Sir Williams Joynson-Hicks, a former Home Secretary of England, quoted from E. Asirvathan, p. 207.

An esteemed correspondent writing to *The Hindu* says: "Here the fundamental problems are poverty, disease and illiteracy. During a century and a half of British rule, the country has been developed in diverse ways, by railway, irrigation, post, telegraph, roads, etc. But the people have been reduced to abject poverty, smitten by disease, and kept in ignorance. The resources of the country are rich but they are available to small privileged classes only. The people are intelligent, but no attempt has been made to educate them. The educational policy has been conditioned by the needs of administration. The result has been university education to the neglect of primary education. Poverty and ignorance have disabled the people from fighting disease. Millions die of the preventable disease of malaria. The toll of epidemics, like cholera, small pox and plague, is heavy. The duties of the state as conceived in advanced European countries and in India are not the same. There are no doubt some common features, e.g. the defence from aggression, internal security and administration of justice. The British in India never considered social service or the development of the individual as part of Government's duty. In Europe social service in practical-

ly all aspects of human life has increasingly been the business of Government. Fighting disease, providing education, relief against unemployment, accidents, and old age are the normal functions of the Government. There the Government helps the people to rise to the height of human development and realize themselves.

"In India the Government is not concerned with the individual or the human side. Government's business is efficient administration of the country. The country has been developed but the people have been stunted."

Statistics show that these generalizations are broadly true. Prof. K. V. Rengaswamy Ayengar writes : "To-day the expenditure on education is only 6 p.c. of the aggregate central and provincial expenditure of the Government. While Great Britain spends 15 shillings per head on education, the corresponding figure for India is only six-pence." ¹

Dr. P. J. Thomas calculates the principal items of expenditure on India in 1937 as follows (crores of rupees) : Defence 47·4, Police 11·2, Law and Justice 7·1, General Administration 12·0, Education 11·9, Public Health 5·6, Civil Works 7·8, Agriculture 2·0 and Debt Charges 16·3.² According to the compilation of the League of Nations, the total expenditure of India for 1936-37 is taken as 1,227 units, Defence Charges consume 503·8, Home Department, Law and Justice, Police Ch. 24·5, Education 10·8, Public Health 6·2, and Social Welfare (Poor Relief, etc.) nil.

Unemployment relief, poor relief, old-age pension, and sickness insurance are practically unknown. While the President of America, the richest country in the world, receives a salary of Rs. 17,062 a month and the Prime Minister of England Rs. 11,111, the salary of the Governor-General of India is Rs. 21,333, not to speak of allowances of various kinds which he enjoys.

1. *Trends in Modern Public Finance*, p. 108.

2. *Federal Finance in India*, p. 494.

Similar striking contrasts can be established between the salaries of cabinet members in foreign lands and of executive councillors in India, as well as between the salaries of provincial governors in India and elsewhere. District Officers in India receive between 1,200 and 3,000 rupees per month, and in Upper India, Divisional Commissioners, without whose services Madras Presidency is able to carry on, receive Rs. 4,000 a month. Even the most ardent admirer of British Imperialism is bound to concede that a poor country like India is saddled with one of the costliest civil administrations in the world.

So far Eddy Asirvathan and he quotes the humorous remark that the Government of India Act 1935 provides Home Rule for the Viceroy, Home Rule for the Governor and Home Rule for British finance-capital and commerce, but little or no Home Rule for the people of India.

These three causes of India's poverty must be considered and a solution must be found to the problem of poverty, disease and bad distribution of wealth.

The People's War and similar papers of the half-learned will cry out of course that there is but one solution possible, viz. the Soviet one. In this connection I would like to narrate the following story.

Some striking statements and statistics about Soviet Emancipation of men, women and nations which appeared in *The People's War* were secretly sent for analysis and "check-up" to a psychological laboratory (the best in the world) of the Propaganda Department of Soviet Russia itself. Alexander Mahinovskey, apparently a comrade but in reality a bourgeois journalist of the former (Fascist) Polish Government, managed to smuggle the result of the enquiry out of Russia.

This shows :

Unconscious lies	54%
Conscious lies	11%
Lies for propaganda	21%
Lies typical of the half-learned <i>nouveaux riches</i>				9%
Lies inspired by genuine altruism	5%
Truth	0%

I am sure my Communist friends will forgive me this crack at their paper.

At present Mother India is faced with a spate of plans and planners who by themselves are fast becoming a problem to each other and to the country.

These are first: innumerable Government plans that, like an air-raid, swoop down from both provincial and central Government headquarters on the country.

The other schemes are well known, at least by name. There is the Gandhian Plan by S. N. Agarwal, the Bombay Plan of the industrialists, and the People's Plan of the Communists.

You, reader, may well ask: Is there not a Catholic solution?

To answer this question we have to remember the following principles. A student with general training knows the importance of distinguishing between Economics as a science and Economics as an art. The science of Economics merely studies the objective laws which rule the economic world, and may build plans and hypotheses accordingly.

On the other hand, the art of Economics tries to apply the science of Economics to real human society. Now, this supposes necessarily a philosophy of life. For at once the question arises: According to what standard are you going to apply the science? What finally do you want society to be? What is the nature and the end of man?

"Man is only an individual being without social responsibility", answers the Liberal of the Manchester type. Therefore he stands for unlimited private property. The aim of society is enrichment. *Laissez-faire, laissez-passar*.—"No," says the classical socialist—"man is only a social being." Therefore there is no room for private property. Religion is the opium of the people. This world and none other is to be the paradise of the proletariat. All private property must be nationalized or completely controlled.

And so, according to various philosophies, the aim of society is said to be the purity of the race,

the state, a class, money. The question is: What do you want? The maximum production? The maximum freedom? The maximum of order? The maximum general good? For, as your philosophy, so will your art of Economics be.

In this sense there *is* a Catholic solution to the social problem: for, Catholicism possesses the complete and eternal philosophy of life. Catholicism considers the whole of man with his complete nature, with his eternal soul, his body, with his essential relationship to society, to the family, to his all-transcendent goal: God. According to Catholicism, the only worthy goal of life in human society is the perfect development of each human being with his rights and duties, both as an individual and as a member of society. Catholicism thus holds on the one hand that man is not a mere independent individual (liberal), and on the other hand that man is not merely a wheel in the great machinery of the state (socialist). Man is not made for society. Society is made for man. Respect for the personality of every human being, respect for man's freedom, respect for the eternal values, these are the great characteristics of the Catholic conception of society. In order to guarantee this goal of man, Catholicism favours a régime of limited private property. It favours the right of private property, but not an unlimited and irresponsible right without control. The use we may make of the right of property is not unlimited. We will see further what this means in the mind of the Church. The Church has no ready-made technical solution of the social problem. She is not a school of Economics. The primary mission of the Church is supernatural in time and in eternity. But the Church, as the *Dharma* of humanity, is also the highest God-appointed guardian of the natural law of man. As such, the Church does not make a new morality, but she has the right and the duty to explain and declare the moral law of humanity. We have seen that she claims the right judgement according to first principles which any economic régime will have to respect, viz. commutative justice, social

justice, charity, human liberty. Next, the Church judges whether a certain régime is or is not conformable to that norm of morality, to what extent it is to be admitted or rejected. The Church approves what is conformable, she rejects what is contrary, to the norm of morality. When a social system is vitiated at the very root of its fundamental principles, the Church condemns and forbids it. Up to now only two such systems have been condemned at least in their pure form, viz. social collectivism and liberalism.

What is the value of the approbation of the Church? By approving of an economic régime, the Church does not mean to impose it or recommend it. She simply means: This economic régime, at least in its essential tenets, is not contrary to the natural law (norm of morality). On the other hand, when the Church condemns an economic régime, it means that, being contrary to the moral law, the Church cannot allow it at all.

It may happen, however, that the Church declares certain things to be not only conformable to the natural law but "exacted" by the moral law as a strict right, as in the question of the living wage and the family wage.

As a private interpreter of the social doctrine of the Church, I have no right to proclaim any particular economic régime to be the official solution of the Church, just as in politics I have no right to defend a monarchy or a republic or anything else as the régime sponsored by the Church.

As such, I have no ready-made complete solution to the social problem, because the Church does not offer any such official solution.

As a private sociologist I may fight, and ought to fight, for that social structure and economic régime which I judge more conducive to social justice and social peace. As such, I can licitly work to make capitalism disappear, provided the means I use and the new régime I propose, be moral in themselves.

The Church expects her true sons to be very active and very enterprising in fighting the social evils of

modern society and in building up a new society based on the foundations of justice and charity. Now, which plan shall we sponsor and which solution shall we propose?

THE GANDHIAN PLAN emphasizes as a basic principle that if democracy is to survive, it must uphold the ideal of a self-sufficient and self-governing rural republic, enjoying the maximum of local autonomy.

The resuscitation of village communities or pan-chayats and the building up of the administrative system from the bottom will usher in true democracy and economic equality.

THE BOMBAY PLAN is briefly as follows :

The present *per capita* income in this country has been estimated at Rs. 65 a year. This is too low even for the needs of bare existence, and the authors of the plan propose to double it in 15 years. But since during this period the population of the country will increase by 5 millions a year, we shall have to expand our aggregate income three times in order to secure a twofold rise of income per head.

Along with the increase of total income, the authors intend to assure to every individual a minimum income of Rs. 74 a year, a sum which they consider essential to the requirements of human existence in our country.

At present the total national income of Rs. 2,200 crores is derived from three main sources, viz. agriculture, industry and services (e.g. the postal service), in the ratio of 53·17 and 22 respectively. Obviously, we are relying too much on agriculture and too little on the other two sources. The planners therefore propose to increase the contributions of the three sections of our economy differently; income from agriculture should expand by 130%, from industry by 500%, and from services by 200%. On this basis our future national income of Rs. 6,360 crores in, say, 1960 would be made up of Rs. 2,670 crores contributed by agriculture, Rs. 2,240 by industry, and Rs. 1,450 crores by services.

The means proposed by the Plan are as follows :

To achieve these increases we shall, according to the plan, require a total capital worth Rs. 10,000 crores which would be distributed among the three branches of activity as follows :

Agriculture	Rs. 1,240 crores
Industry	„ 4,480 „
Services	„ 4,280 „

The aggregate capital is to be raised in the following manner :

<i>External Finance</i>	<i>Crores</i>	<i>Internal Finance</i>	
Hoarded wealth	Rs. 300	Savings	Rs. 4,000
Sterling securities	„ 1,000	Cleared money	„ 3,400
Balance of trade	„ 6,000		
Foreign borrowing	„ 700		
Total Rs. 8,000		Total Rs. 7,400	

Finally, the Plan will be realized in three five-year stages.

With regard to the *People's Plan*, even from the Communist point of view, it cannot be said to be original either in statistics or in constructive data. The underlying philosophy is of course not new either. An all-powerful state will nationalize all land and all means of production in the nation. Even in this section of the Plan, not much original scholarship is apparent.

Now let us consider each of the plans reviewed.

With regard to the Government plans, some of them are very good and very practical, though none of them faces the essential problem of India's poverty as a whole as the other plans have attempted to do. Some plans, as the Sargent Scheme, the Health Insurance Scheme for industrial workers and others, are bound to be considered, at least in part, even by a National Government in India. No racial bias should ever make us blind to any constructive contribution that may be made towards the solution of India's social problems.

The Collectivist Programme, whatever its accidental or secondary contribution may be, stands condemned by its own basic principles.

First, Communism is based upon the materialistic philosophy of Dialectical Materialism.

Secondly, Communism, by history and by principle, will prove to be the murderer of the Indian peasantry, not its saviour. If not deceived, Indian peasants will refuse to go the same way as the Russian Kulaks. Communism is making a desperate attempt at infiltrating *via* the towns into rural India in order to arrange a typical Hindu marriage in which the bride (the Indian peasantry) will not be consulted.

Thirdly, Communism cannot logically uphold the respect due to certain essential human values that already existed before the state and that are worth more than all the states of the whole world together.

These values are: the human personality, a minimum of personal freedom, the family, the soul, and religion.

Complete state-ownership means complete state-control. Complete state-control means totalitarianism. Totalitarianism means the slave state of Herr Nazi or the files of Comrade Red Tape or the concentration camps (the worst in the world) of Comrade O.G.P.U.

The Gandhian Plan contains many sound ideas and much constructive material. But its great contribution towards a social programme is the emphasis laid on the village-unit as the basis and centre of any scheme of reconstruction.

One criticism I venture to make, viz. that the plan has failed to tackle the evil effects of capitalism *within* the village walls. In this matter the Gandhian Plan has not been as bold as the Bombay Plan, which endorses the main conclusion of the Floud Commission for the whole of India: viz. suppression of the Zemindari System.

This Zemindari System was introduced by Lord Cornwallis who transformed the farmers and collectors of revenue under Mogul administration into landlords. This *must* be undone.

The Bombay Plan, though at one with many of Gandhi's ideas about village industries, disagrees with the Gandhi Plan on the importance, the quality and the volume of industries that the authors propose to introduce in India.

Both plans, however, are based on the principle of private property; one of the main features of society will remain private property.

But private property will not remain unlimited and uncontrolled by the State. State intervention and nationalization of public utilities such as post and telegraph and railways is taken for granted in the programme.

The above principles of both the Gandhian Plan and the Bombay Plan are on the whole in agreement with Catholic social principles. I am not a professional economist and I am not good at mathematics, but I know from the experience of twenty years personal contact that the peasant and workman of India would hail a programme of reconstruction based on these principles.

The Bombay Plan seems to reflect more the vision of Jawaharlal Nehru than any other.

Could not a synthesis be built of these two systems, the Gandhian Plan with its emphasis on the village unit, and the Bombay Plan with its emphasis on industries?

Perhaps Mr. H. Belloc's line of thought might eventually give the clue to uniting the thesis and anti-thesis of village and industry in a grand synthesis of an Economic Programme worthy of India.

Landlordism should be replaced by a well-protected peasant proprietorship, and plutocratic capitalism by small-scale ownership through substantial shares of the peasants and especially of the workmen in the capital of the great industries of India.

This type of distribution aims at multiplying private property rather than at suppressing it. A minimum "Economic Unit" of land for every peasant and a minimum number of shares primarily for every workman in every factory but also for other classes of men each according to his merit, that is the aim of the principle of distributism, on which principle a synthesis might be made and worked out.

Here a Catholic National University might do research work and eventually help in the building up

of a new Indian Economy that would satisfy the demands of the greatest of India's people, the workmen, the peasants, and their leaders. I feel sure India's greatest leaders would appreciate this effort.

By way of conclusion I would like to say: Plans and programmes are absolutely necessary in this world. But more necessary still is the *right ideal* that gives a soul to the programmes. Human programmes are from the start doomed to dismal failure unless they bear unspoiled the seal of Him who is the Highest Ideal of Humanity. The sons of the French and of the Russian Revolutions were incapable of guaranteeing the "rights of man" which they themselves had proclaimed. So are the victors of the present war with regard to the Atlantic Charter and its four freedoms.

Only the Church of Christ, which has suffered more than the men of today, more than the teeming millions of the East and West, more than the exploited masses of India, only this Church is able to understand India's social problem and is fit to train and inspire the social leaders of the nation.

Christ calls for a band of great thinkers and workers in order to build up to the best of human ability a detailed programme of rural and industrial reconstruction, a programme in which most will be made of India's natural resources, and above all a programme in which men, women, and children will be considered more important than anything else.

WHAT shall I do for
Christ ?

IGNATIUS LOYOLA

Volunteers Of Jesus Christ

THE CALL OF THE KING

THE CALL of Catholicism is not simply the call of a philosophy; it is the call of a living Person. Dear reader, do you remember the moments in your life when you felt in your heart a call to higher things? It happened, perhaps, when walking with a friend, when reading a book, when admiring the beauty of nature, or was it when you felt the first pang in your heart at the sight of India's poverty-stricken millions? At that moment Christ was working in your heart with His grace, making you realize His call: "Come, follow Me!" If you tell me that you have tried to follow Him, may I ask you: "Did you follow the true Christ?" God has not to conform to our way of thinking; we must conform to His! We have seen that a man's religion is his own, and not the product of the soil and the race as Alfred Rosenberg in *The Myth of the 20th Century* would have liked to make us believe. The maxim *Cuius regio, illius religio* is wrong.

Some say: "I will come over when my fellow countrymen come over or when it will be less hard." When I hear this said, I involuntarily think of the young man in the Gospel who, when called upon for personal service in the Cause of Christ, had not the courage and went away sad, for "he had many possessions" I wonder how he spent his life later on; but I cannot believe that his riches did ever satisfy that heart to which Christ had spoken on

that great day of his life. To wait for others to come over when Truth is calling at the gate of your heart, dear reader, would that not be playing with God's grace? When St. Paul became convinced of the claim of Jesus Christ, he did not wait for his own nation to accept that claim. Alone, wrestling with himself, he submitted to the call that came to his soul; alone he witnessed to the Truth. And Paul's example has had many followers both in the East and in the West. "Heroism", you will say. But I ask you: "Tell me the name of an individual or a nation that has ever been great without heroism." The great satisfaction in life consists in the conviction that in the future no part of my life, talents or desires need remain idle or sterile; that, on the contrary, all I am and all I have can yield its maximum value. The fact that you have great desires proves that Christ calls you to heroism. When you touch a powerful tuning-fork, the sound waves travel in all directions trying to rouse sympathetic echoes; when they pass over cloth, the cloth does not vibrate; but let them touch a glass of crystal or a blade of fine metal and at once a secret affinity will make them vibrate with that self-same rhythm of the tuning-fork. The call of the Redeemer vibrates in the world of souls as the sound of that tuning-fork. Many the souls that remain slack and passive like a rag at the call; but others are stirred in their deepest fibre. They have found themselves vibrating to a rhythm unsuspected before. It was the call of the Master.

Now, when your heart has been stirred by that call, or when the cold logic of your mind is pointing at Him as the needle of the compass points to the North, do not close your ears, do not harden your heart, do not stifle the logic of your reason. Do not treat as a foreigner Him who is more intimate with you than your own father and mother. Ask yourself with St. Ignatius:

What have I done for Christ?

What am I doing for Christ?

What shall I do for Christ?

Christ calls you :

To the true Faith (supernatural Faith), and in the true Faith to the true Knowledge of Him and to the true Life in Him.

Baptism together with the Eucharist are the God-chosen means of incorporation in Christ's Church and in Christ's Mystical Body ; Baptism imprints on the Christian soul the insignia of Christ.

" He that believeth in me, hath everlasting life " (JOHN vi, 47).

" Amen, amen I say to thee, unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God " (JOHN iii, 5).

" He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved : but he that believeth not, shall be condemned " (MARK xvi, 16).

TO-MORROW

Lord, what am I, that, with unceasing care,
Thou didst seek after me, — that Thou didst wait
Wet with unhealthy dews, before my gate,
And pass the gloomy nights of winter there ?

O strange delusion ! that I did not greet
Thy blest approach, and O ! to Heaven how lost,
If my ungratitude's unkindly frost
Has chilled the bleeding wounds upon Thy feet.

How oft my guardian angel gently cried,
" Soul, from thy casement look, and thou shalt see
How He persists to knock and wait for thee ! "

And, O ! how often to that voice of sorrow
" To-morrow we will open," I replied,
And when the morrow came, I answered still,
" To-morrow ".

Lope de Vega, trans. Longfellow

CHRIST CALLS YOU TO HOLINESS

Baptism is not a mere passive incorporation in Christ ; Christ wants to act *through* us, not merely *for* us. Christ has not liberated us from the possibility of sinning (and of hell if we die unrepentant). God could have arranged things otherwise, but He has not done so and He must have His reasons. Frightened by the lure of a sensual and unjust world, Christians have been known to lift up their hands to God praying : " Lord bind my hands that they may not do evil — bind my feet that they may not stray from your path — bind my heart, my imagination, my blood and my desires." But God has answered them as He answered St. Paul : " My grace is sufficient to you, provided you use that grace." God does not want humanity to be a crowd of marionettes ; God wishes to see around Him free men, who in spite of painful efforts and wounding thorns freely work their way up towards their full self-realization in Christ.

Though the first work of our sanctification may be seemingly negative : avoiding sin, rooting out selfishness, etc., in reality Christian renunciation bears the mark of an expansion of the soul rather than of a repression. When we curb our lower nature, when we check our innate greed and selfishness, we do so for the sake of a higher life in Christ. Those mortifications are not limitations, they are preferences. True Christian spirituality is essentially *positive* in its tendency because it is concentrated on Christ, not on our poor selves. No outlook on life is more healthy, more powerful in the battle of life. All spiritual or devotional exercises in Catholicism have but one final aim : to strengthen devotion to and love of Jesus Christ. This love must dominate and control our nature. This love for Christ makes Catholic spirituality at once so simple and so sublime. So simple because there is no need in its asceticism of extraordinary feats and records which

are the privilege of the few. We have simply to take the material which God has given us and of that material the chisel of our will must shape the image of Christ. Men with great natural defects have been known to become great saints. Holiness is not inherited, it is achieved, acquired inch by inch with the help of Christ. The world of to-day, India not excepted, is in desperate need of saints. William James, who never recovered from his early atheist education, could not but notice the need of saints in the world. He writes: "Saints are the animators of potentialities of goodness which but for them would lie forever dormant. It is not possible to be quite as mean as we naturally are when they have passed before us. One fire kindles another; and without that over-trust in human worth which they show, the rest of us would lie in spiritual stagnancy." We would add that Catholic saints are not only animators of potentialities in human society; they are moreover living witnesses to the supernatural in the world.

Let me be as the carbon-point of an electric lamp in the full current of Thy Divinity.

Black, dark and vile, but lighten Thou my heaviness, approach the quivering points and cast Thy ray over my dead darkness.

Struggle with me until I flush; stream me through till I glow; overcome me that I may become a living brightness; then lift me high on the staff for all who toil in the night and would fain see, at least, something of Thy Light!

O the sad abandonment of that night work; for those who rest by those who watch—burn away my obstinacy . . . boil my seething points until they sigh with pain, and when conquered, I withdraw so that the light trembles, fails: touch the contact of Thy Love, drive me, lift me again, until I glow before the wearied workers.

If they but see Thy light because I shine with Thee, may my points be blunted, my hard carbon gnaw away until burnt out.

Thus the whole night through, high above, alone on my staff, hour by hour, now glowing, now thrilling in pain, and then again the strong white glow . . . ever driven by the force of Thy love !

Until worn out and useless, the carbon is cast out by the wayside . . . If only Thy Light has shone through me in the night time . . . if only a few have seen better to perform their nightly task . . . praise be to Thee ! For carbon is but carbon — Thou alone art Light, the light which makes it wondrous bright.

A. COPPENS, *The Arc Lamp*

CHRIST CALLS YOU TO BE HIS VOLUNTEER

Dear reader, through Baptism you will receive in your soul the title and insignia of *citizenship* in the kingdom of Christ. Over and above this, Christ wishes to confer on you the sacrament of Confirmation by which you will be raised to the rank of *soldier* in Christ's kingdom. Through this sacrament Christ will give you the strength — and, if necessary, the heroism — to live up to your calling, both as an individual Catholic and as a Catholic citizen of your motherland. Every Catholic has to be an apostle of Christ ; this he can do in either of the following ways :

- (1) By becoming a religious, if Christ calls him
and perhaps a priest ;
- (2) by being a man of Catholic Action.

THE VOCATION TO THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

India has always manifested her faith in the unseen world by erecting *maths* and by developing a system of monasticism in which she has ever hoped and dreamt to see men or women devote themselves to the highest service of God. Unhappily most of those *maths* have fallen into disuse and decay and they too are clamouring for a principle of Resurrection. Here again Christ is the solution. The true Christ is the historical centre of the most wonderful system of religious and monastic life ever developed upon earth. The text-books, when mentioning with good reason the too human aspect of many a monastery of the Renaissance, often forget to mention the great work in matters religious, social, artistic, and educational, which the Church achieved through her cloisters. Mystics as Thomas a Kempis (*Imitation of Christ*), St. John of the Cross, St. Francis of Assisi, St. Gertrude, St. Teresa of Avila, St. Theresa of the Child Jesus, and other saints, dear to India's heart, were all monks or nuns. The monasteries were energizing centres of social service, of rural reconstruction, of the guild system, of art, music, painting, architecture. I do not intend developing this topic further as I am concerned with the future, not with the past. What I wish to point out here is the fact that there is not one way in Catholicism, there are hundreds of ways of serving God and man. All those religious orders for men and women have their own founder or foundress, their own constitution, their own specific aim, ranging from the life of the highest mysticism and asceticism between the four walls of a monastery or convent (as for instance, the Carmelites¹ or the

1. The daughter of Count Ogomachi, a descendant of the Fujiwares, one of the oldest families at the Imperial Court of Japan, was received at the Carmelite Monastery, Tokyo. She is now known as Sister Elizabeth of the Trinity.

Trappists²) to the most active life in the world (as the Sisters of the Poor, the Grail Members, etc.). But all serve one Master — Jesus Christ. The personality of Christ is so rich and so inexhaustible, that giant souls, like St. Francis of Assisi or Teresa of Avila, have tried to imitate one special feature of Christ in a heroic degree.

St. Francis was struck by the Poverty, the Passion and Suffering of the Master, and we find the same spirituality stamped on the Orders he founded, viz. the Franciscan Orders for men and women.

St. Benedict had been impressed by the glory of the God-man, and we see his various followers, Cistercians, Trappists, etc., singing to this day the praises of the *Rex Aeternæ Gloriæ*, the King of Eternal Glory, during several hours of their busy days and even at night.

St. Teresa, the great Reformer of the Carmelite Order, wished to make of her foundations so many gardens where the most beautiful souls of the human race could spend a life of utter devotion to God and to mankind.

St. John of God, founder of the Brothers Hospitalers, found one day a beggar in the street, deserted and apparently dying. He took him upon his shoulders and carried him to the hospital. There he laid him on a bed and began to wash his feet. But the feet had gaping wounds in them ; John looked up in surprise and found the beggar had been transfigured into Jesus Christ.

Shall the day not come when the best of Indian families will consider it an honour to have a son or daughter consecrated to God in a Catholic religious Order? Catholicism could supply India with Indian Orders (or branches of Orders) old or new, Orders with

The Carmel of Tokyo was founded in 1930 by the monastery of Cholet, France. Applications for admission which have been received so far will quickly fill to capacity the permanent convent now nearing completion in the outskirts of Tokyo. Fides. Rome, May 26, 1934. In India there are several Carmels.

2. Trappists are also found in Japan. When will they come to India?

ashrams all over rural India for India's rural reconstruction, teaching Orders with staffs perfectly fit for the intellectual and moral training of the cultured class of India, Catholic Orders of which Mr. Gandhi dreamt many a time. Actually there are noviciates in three parts of India for enlisting Indians in the "Society of Jesus". Many Indians have joined the Order (which counts about 28,000 members all over the world), many Indians from all parts of the country are studying or teaching in the various colleges of the "Society of Jesus" in India, in Europe or in America.

I have personally lived in those Jesuit colleges, each a small league of nations, and I can testify that there the lie is given to the pagan maxim: "East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet." I do testify that our mutual relations were not official but most intimate, and that we loved one another as real friends and brothers.

The Gregorian University in Rome has a whole community of Indian Jesuits side by side with a community of Chinese, Europeans, Americans, etc., of course living all together and on the basis of perfect equality and friendship, even during the most bitter periods of this war. The staff too is very cosmopolitan and Catholic in the real sense of the word.

It is clear from this that the call to the religious life is the monopoly of no nation. Christ invites His intimate followers both in East and in West, and religious life is possible for all those who have the required qualities, intellectual, moral and physical, according to the specific aim of each Order. The Catholic religious Orders remain an everlasting challenge to a world which ever tries to organize itself on a purely materialistic basis.

A Catholic India would evidently have its own priesthood, as is the case already in several dioceses of the South. What is more, there is no reason why India should not give one day to the Church a Pope at Rome. The Catholic Mission, as we know it at

present in most parts of the country, is necessarily a transient institution of the Church. The normal condition is that the visible Church, rooted in the soil, be her own mission.

We want an Indian clergy, highly intellectual, alert at the needs of the times, really spiritual and ascetic, intensely social-minded, thoroughly Indian in culture, Catholic in Faith and Catholic in outlook : priests worthy of India and the Church. Christ confers on His chosen priests the highest insignia here on earth, the character of His own Priesthood. Through this, mere mortals are made His ambassadors among men, the echoes of His voice, the channels of His Grace, the fathers of an eternal progeny of the spirit.

THE VOCATION TO CATHOLIC ACTION

The call to the Religious life is a *free* call of Christ the answer to which will finally rest on the free choice of the chosen ones ; it is not *obligatory*, as is the call to the Catholic Faith. In fact, it will always be the few who will join the religious orders ; by far the great majority are called to the state of Holy Matrimony in order to help the Creator in making new citizens both of India and of the Kingdom of Heaven.

The religious life, that is, the state of life of those who vow to aim at perfection, is distinct from the state of the layman, not as the pure is opposed to the impure (God forbid !) but rather as a certain human activity, socially organized in view of a specific spiritual aim, is opposed to another kind of human activity whose specific aim is the temporal order. — Note, however, that those two specific aims do not exclude one another absolutely. The temporal order, though not sacred by definition, ought to aim at sanctity in order

to make the whole visible world sacred. The world of culture and civilization, whose specific aim is the temporal order, ought to be lit up and transfigured by the transcendent rays of the Sun of Faith and Grace: Jesus Christ. In this way, the world will become inhabitable for men whose highest destiny is eternal life in God.

It is to the specific forces of temporal human activity, the laity, that the visible head of the Catholic Church has sent forth his trumpet-call of *Catholic Action*, as if wishing to emphasize for our times a new current of spirituality (new in emphasis and organization) which ought to balance and subdue the modern forces of materialism and atheism.

Whatever be the Catholic organizations which come under the term "Catholic Action" strictly so called, we should never limit Catholic Action to a purely spiritual activity only. This would be to misunderstand Catholic Action and to indulge in a new kind of "Liberalism" worse than any we knew before. The Pope himself on numerous occasions warns us emphatically against this danger. In his letter to the Catholic associations for workmen in Belgium, he calls them a "perfect type of Catholic Action" though they aim at the social, political, moral, and religious uplift of the proletariat. This example among many shows that Catholic Action is not purely an academical affair; it ought to be intensely practical.

Besides, the Pope himself plainly distinguishes between *Actio Catholica qua talis*, Catholic Action as such, and Catholic Action in a much broader sense. (See *Address to the Bishops of Lithuania*, 14th June 1928.) In the strict sense, it covers the specifically religious works which are in accordance with the primary mission of the Church. In the broader sense, Catholic Action includes all Catholic organizations, directly or indirectly approved of by the hierarchy, but for which the hierarchy does not take the responsibility, nor the direction, nor the execution. Broadly speaking, this last type of Catholic Action includes the whole work of Redemption, not only in its primary object, which is the eternal

salvation of souls, but also in its secondary object, which is the gradual healing of the wounds which Original Sin has left in man's nature. This secondary object of the Redemption does not aim at making of this world the kingdom of heaven, but rather, according to the respective ideals of different ages and climates, at making of this world a truly human home, with plenty of weakness left certainly, but also full of love; a place where the various structures of society are based on justice, on the dignity of human personality and on fraternal love. Such an ordered abode cannot fail to acclimatize our souls and prepare the way to the eternal Bliss to which we all are called.

In order to work in a new world, we must have the right idea of the world.

First, we will see what the world is not. It is not simply the *reign of the devil* as many Protestants have held. This would mean that the world is not really saved. Such a conception is the logical consequence of the schism between grace and nature. Neither is the world simply a *theocratic empire* where the temporal as well as the spiritual power of the world would be seated in a clerical theocracy. This idea, fully evolved, was at the root of the theocratic imperialism of Henry VIII, of Hegelianism, of Marxism, and of Russian Communism. Nor is the world simply the *realm of man* without any relation to a supernatural world. This humanism, falsely so called, has been the ideal of many since the Renaissance. Not only the word of Christ but also the testimony of history is proof that such an attempt is Utopian. It has landed us in an atheistic theocracy.

According to complete Christianity, the world is a kingdom belonging at the same time to God, to man and to the devil. To God it belongs by *right of creation* (continued creation); to the devil by *right of conquest* on account of sin; to Christ, the God-man, by *right of victory* over the first conqueror, the devil. The world is truly saved, but the benefit and the titles of Christ's victory have to be applied both in the world

of souls and in the world of matter. It is true that this giant task of Christianity will never meet with *perfect* success. Christ foretold that even at the end of time cockle would be found mixed up with the wheat. This is no reason for despair or for laziness. On the contrary. The world is sanctified inasmuch as it is not only the world pure and simple but also the world transformed by and assumed in the world of Christ's incarnation. This tension in the world's history is the hall-mark of real progress; it is the way which prepares positively the final kingdom: Heaven.

THE TEMPORAL MISSION OF THE CHRISTIAN IN THE MODERN WORLD

From the above considerations the temporal mission of the Christian is clear: The time of Cartesian dualism has definitely passed. The Christian is more and more conscious of his duty to take his stand in the social, the economic, and political domain. It is evident that this new consciousness will be directed against both capitalistic and communistic materialism. At the same time appears in full light the proper positive mission of the laity with regard to the world and to civilization. The French thinker, Jacques Maritain, describes this mission in the following terms:

"Whilst the Church on the one hand, careful above all things to be incorporated in no temporal form or institution whatsoever, is more and more liberated, not from the task of passing judgement from on high but from the task of administering and managing directly the temporal — the Christian, on the other hand finds himself more and more engaged in the world not as Christian or as member of the Church as such, but as citizen of the world or rather as a Christian citizen of

the world : a Christian citizen, who is conscious of his call to work at establishing a new Christian temporal Order.

"From this it is clear what giant problems are waiting for solution at the hands of the Christian. He ought to frame a social philosophy, a system of philosophic and economic thought which does not rest satisfied with stating the bare universal principles, but which is capable of coming to grips with concrete realizations. This supposes a vast and delicate field of work. This work has been begun already by Leo XIII and Pius XI who have fixed the main principles.

"But the Christian who is conscious of all this will have to take his stand also in the social and in the political field of action.

"As the social-Christian is inseparable from the spiritual-Christian, it is evidently impossible that a Christian transformation of the temporal order be realized in the usual way and with the usual means by which other transformations and revolutions take place. *If the Christian transformation of the world takes place, it will be and can only be the result of Christian heroism.*

"The Christian transformation of the world will be either the fruit of sanctity or it will not happen at all : I mean a sanctity directed towards the temporal, the secular, the profane.

"If a new Christianity is to spring forth in the future, it will be the work of such sanctity."—*Revue de Philosophie*, Janvier 1935.

Dear reader, whoever you are, man or woman, brilliant student or poor clerk, rich or poor, Christ calls you to the field of souls and to the field of the world. He does not call you primarily on account of your talents or of your greater or smaller merits ; He deigns to call you for the sake of yourself and for the sake of those He wishes to entrust to your care.

"Every factory a fortress", cries the communist, but they are found to be fortresses of hate. "Every factory, every office, every school, every university a living cell!" That is the wish of Christ. Are you

ready to follow Christ's call to be the heart of such a life cell in your respective spheres of action? There must be a power-station of Christ's volunteers in every important centre or department in India : power-stations where the golden arrows of Truth and the white swords of Love and Charity will be manufactured for the great offensive of Christ in India.

This is the age of youth — and we are young,
We give our lives that God may reign in truth,
First in our hearts, and then through all the world.
We fight His fight, and will be used by Him.
This do we claim, to give our youth to God,
To give our youth — and thus to win the world.

Grail Song

KHRISTA-RAJYA

“ Men of little faith ” have asked themselves with a doubtful look : “ Will India ever be Catholic ? ”

Our ways are not God's ways. What is impossible to-day may be a fact a hundred years hence. Syncretism and modernism are sweeping away not only what is superstitious but also, alas, what is healthy and strong in the old religions of Hindustan.

It was the same in the Roman Empire. When Peter, the Fisherman, came to Rome, who could have foretold that 300 years later the empire would be Catholic?

You want a more modern example? Take the Church in the United States. Just a few figures : When John Carroll was consecrated first Bishop of the United States less than 150 years ago, there were six Catholic churches in the country, and the Catholic population, scattered over a vast territory, was estimated at 20,000. To-day the number of churches is over 20,000, the priests number close on 40,000, and the Catholic population is more than 24,000,000. To show

the extent of the Catholic school system in the United States, we may mention that there are 8,036 Catholic elementary schools employing 60,000 teachers, and attended by 2,146,813 pupils ; 2,413 high schools staffed by 14,000 teachers, with 477,190 pupils ; 211 colleges and universities, with 7,000 professors and 102,655 students ; 80 normal schools, where 1,300 instructors train 14,000 prospective teachers ; 332 seminaries with 3,000 professors and an enrolment of more than 22,000 candidates for the priesthood.

At present Catholics are a minority in India. The latest statistics give a total of 5,000,000 Catholics in India and Ceylon. Yet hopeful signs are seen on the horizon.

If modern or future leaders answer God's call faithfully, it is possible and even probable that 150 years hence India will be the Catholic jewel of Asia.

Dear reader, be not put out. Miss Pusillanimity will come to you in robes of silk and whisper softly in your ears, half appealing, half reproaching : " These are all dreams. Remember La Fontaine's fable of the ridiculous frog which tried to inflate itself to the size of the buffalo. No wonder the little thing exploded in effort." " Therefore," concludes Miss Pusillanimity, " the danger lies in excess of ambition. Why not believe in the elegant philosophy of moderation in ideals ? Dispel those dreams by games and other distractions. Remember the frog of La Fontaine ! "

All of us remember the old frog. But where is the cartoonist who will depict to us the efforts, at least as ridiculous and disastrous, of the buffalo which, in order to reduce the vulnerable parts of its body, tried desperately to shrink to the size of a frog ? Pusillanimity, the horror of great risks, of heroic deeds, of personal responsibility, is tainting the souls of modern youths ; narrow-mindedness and narrow-heartedness is working havoc with our soul, with our best ideals, and with our motherland.

Young India, hearken to the clatter of arms in the living epic of modern India. Hope and Despair, the

two sources of Hindu life and worship, are arrayed against each other in a battle of life and death. If the tide of creature worship, the force of Despair were to wash away the *Sanâtana Dharma*, it would mean that the strongest appeal of India's heart for Christ would be crushed in black despair. Again, the *Bhakti* movement, with its fundamental longing for Christ, is fighting for the soul of India with modern Pantheism, which is not only self-idolatry (man, being what he is, cannot be God), but is also the death-trap of religion, morality, responsibility, and liberty.

Young India, rally round Christ the King, it is not yet too late. It is the few that have revolutionized the world of thought and love, for good or for evil. Christ calls on the forces of India's supreme Hope. He says: " Young India, I say to thee, arise ! "

As we have seen, the world according to the Vedanta has but one supreme meaning, not many meanings as the modern prophets would have us believe. That supreme meaning can be only Christ. Christ is the supreme meaning of the world and therefore of India, and that even independently of any conscious recognition. The future of India as a nation a hundred years hence will finally depend on the free but responsible choice of the Indian leaders.

Whatever be India's future a hundred years hence, the personal call of Christ to each one of us is no less insistent and laden with personal responsibility: " Come, follow Me. "

We have said in the beginning of this book that in a sense the heart of Religion is Love: Love, the part of God towards us and — never forget it — love, our part towards God.

When describing Catholicism, we saw that God has fulfilled His part. Have we fulfilled our part?

VOLUNTEERS OF CHRIST

GENERAL AIM : Inspired by the teaching of Jesus Christ

1. I shall foster communal harmony between Hindus, Muslims, Christians, and other communities.

2. I shall, wherever possible, give preferential service to the poor and oppressed, especially in rural India and in the suburbs.

3. I shall respect India's natural leaders.

4. I shall be tolerant of diverse parties and opinions.

5. I shall be loyal to Christ and to the Motherland.

PRACTICAL AIM : Pray, work, suffer and sacrifice that India may be spiritually one in Jesus Christ.

MOTTO $\frac{\frac{A}{I} \mid \frac{F}{I}}{C}$ ALL FOR INDIA,
INDIA FOR CHRIST.

BADGE : Any small cross, crucifix or medal of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, to be carried close to the breast, not necessarily in sight.

MEANS : (1) As a rule remain in the family, college, profession in which I find myself. Enlist personally in the *Volunteer Corps of Christ*. The more efficient I am in my studies or profession, the better I will be able to serve the Master.

(2) Have a personal love for Jesus Christ, but remember that true love is proved by deeds.

SECTIONS : Two (I) The Aspirants.

(II) The Volunteers Proper.

RULES OF THE ASPIRANTS

CONDITIONS OF ENLISTMENT : Any honest man or woman can become an aspirant. How ?

Kneel before a crucifix or a cross (which, if need be, you can make yourself out of two pieces of wood) ; recollect yourself and put yourself into the conscious presence of God. The laws of the aspirant are as follows :

1. I promise to join the *Volunteer Corps of Christ* by receiving the Sacrament of Baptism in the Roman Catholic Church.

2. In the meantime I will study the Catholic faith and live it with God's grace. As often as time allows, I will be united in spirit with Jesus Christ. I will pray to Him for my own and for India's conversion.

3. I recognize the successor of Peter at Rome as my spiritual *guru*. I will try to see a Catholic priest.

4. I will exercise myself in recognizing Jesus Christ in the poor.

5. With God's grace, I wish the highest motive of all my works, sufferings and joys to be : Jesus Christ. Out of love for Him, I will check, rule and order my passions and my human selfishness. Every day I at a definite time will examine myself for at least 5 minutes to see whether I have been faithful to Jesus. And no day shall pass without at least one act of perfect love of God and of perfect contrition for my past sins.

THE VOLUNTEERS PROPER

CATHOLICS ONLY

CONDITIONS OF ENLISTMENT : Kneel before the Blessed Sacrament where dwells the living Master, Jesus Christ. Recollect yourself, speak to your Friend and King :

IN GENERAL : I promise to be a good Catholic with all it implies. (A lax Catholic is not fit for volunteer-work in Christ's army.)

ESPECIALLY : (1) My great devotion shall be to Jesus in the Sacrifice of Holy Mass where He is and ever remains the Source and the Model of my own life of sacrifice.

(2) I will always remember that charity towards *all* men is *the* great command of Christ, and that *the* great sin is want of charity. I will try not only to bring relief to physical and moral misery but also, in the light of Catholic principles, to find a remedy for the root causes of suffering and poverty in modern society.

(3) Wherever India is in need of absolute honesty and unselfishness in the line of politics or social reconstruction, I will be among the first to answer the call.

(4) I will respect and love my non-Catholic brethren, whoever they be, not simply in order to make converts but primarily because God loves them and has called them with me to be co-citizens of the same India and, if we are faithful, of the same Heaven.

(5) It will be my primary duty to foster communal harmony, especially among Hindus, Muslims, and Christians, and other communities.

(6) When attacked in the press, we will recognize our guilt with Christian humility in case we are guilty ; but if we are not, we will defend ourselves chiefly when the rights of personal liberty, of the family and of Christ's Church, are at stake (we hate the Totalitarian State under any of its forms) ; yet never shall we use unfair means in our defence.

(7) I will try to be an active member of an organized group of Catholic Action.

(8) Daily examination of conscience (10 minutes) in order to examine whether my love towards Jesus and towards man has been worthy of my Christian calling.

PERIOD OF SERVICE : A lifetime, day and night.

WAGES : The personal love of Jesus Christ. Growth in Sanctifying Grace.

HIGHEST DECORATION ; Vision of God face to face for all eternity.

ORIENTAL INSTITUTE, CALCUTTA
LIGHT OF THE EAST SERIES NO. 16

Cum permissu Superiorum

